SCHISM DIS-ARM'D

OF

The Defensive Weapons,

LENT IT

By Doctor *Hammond*,

and the Bishop of

DERRY.

By *S. W.*

Prov. 17. 15.

Qui justificat impium, & qui condemnat justum abominabilis est uterque apud Deum.

At PARIS:

By *M. Blageart.* 1655.

SCHISM DISARMD

OF

Th[illegible] Wrapons

[illegible]

[illegible] Doctor Hammond

[illegible] Bishop of

[illegible]

Question

[illegible]

Petrus [illegible] Pyr 17. 15.

[illegible]

Hic [illegible]

W[illegible] Dom.

[illegible]

A PARIS:

[illegible] Mrs. Hegart. 1655.

To the Reader.

BEfore you can have paſt three Chapters, I know you will be objecting, that the blows I give are too rude for ſo civil an *Adverſary*, and therefore I have plac'd theſe few Lines to meet you in the very entry, and ſtop you, till you have anſwered this Queſtion. How would you take it, if one ſhould ſpit in your face, and juſtifie the affront, becauſe his breath is ſweet? or, What would you ſay to him, that ruines your Eſtate by Perjury, and defends himſelf, that he held up his hands and eyes to Heaven, and ſwore demurely? Whatever Anſwer you give, I am confident it will perfectly clear my behavior towards the Doctor; with whom I ſhould have very little contention, were the difference between

us in any thing of leſs concernment then Eternity.

Let him, if he pleaſe, maintain, with all his Rhetorick, that King *Richard* was a ſtrait and handſom Perſon; let him employ as much wit, as he thinks he has, to prove *Perkin Warbeck* no Counterfeit; for my part, I ſhall be ſo far from finding fault with him, that I ſhall not ſo much, as ſeek any: But if he will abuſively treat matters of ſo high importance as Religion, and think to eſcape, becauſe his perverſe meaning goes diſguis'd, under the maſk of a courteous ſtile. I conceive my ſelf ſufficiently warranted, if ſometimes in pulling off his Vizard, I twitch him by the Beard; eſpecially ſince falſhood is ſo much the worſe, the better it is expreſt, every one being apt to believe there is ſurely ſome *Reaſon*, where there appears no *Paſſion*.

S. W.

THE

THE
Table of the *Contents* of the several *Sections*.

The Introduction.

The First Part.
Containing an Answer to the Four first Chapters.

Sect. 1. *Notes upon Dr. Hammonds first Chapter, Of the danger and sin of* Schism P. 1
Sect. 2. *Concerning his notion of* Schism, *and the Excommunication of the Church* 6
Sect. 3. *Of his Plea of a weak Conscience, not suffering him to subscribe to the Churches Doctrine, against his present perswasion* 14
Sect. 4. *Concerning the ground of* Unity, *groundlesness of* Schism; *and of his manner of arguing to clear himself of the later* 21
Sect. 5. *Contains some observations upon his third Chapter, Of the division of* Schism 29
Sect. 6. *Of the Doctors advance towards the Question, in the beginning of his fourth Chapter* 37
Sect. 7. *Of his first* Evidence *against St.* Peters *Universal Pastorship* 42
Sect. 8. *The Examination of his second* Evidence, *that the Apostles had distinct Provinces, so to prejudice St.* Peters *Universal Pastorship* 48
Sect. 9. *Some Consequences out of the Doctors*

The Table.

former Grounds, and his further proceſs in Evidencing 55

Sect. 10. *The Examination of Ten dumb Teſtimonies, which* Dr. Hammond *brings to plead for him* 63

Sect. 11. *The Examination of his irrefragable Evidence, and other ſilent Teſtimonies produced by him* 71

Sect. 12. *Another dumb ſhow of the* Doctors *Teſtimonies, to prove St.* Peter *over the Jews onely* 80

Sect. 13. *His ſecond general* Evidence *againſt St.* Peters *Supremacy, from the Donation of the Keys, found to be obſcurer then the former* 87

The Second Part.

Comprehending the Anſwers of the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Chapters.

Sect. 1. *OF the pretended Primogeniture of* Antioch, *and the* Doctors *miſtake of the Council of* Chalcedon 105

Sect. 2. *His Arguments from the Canon of* Epheſus, *and the Inſtances relating to* Juſtiniana Prima *refuted* 115

Sect. 3: *A diſcovery of the* Doctors *Fundamental Error, which runs through this Chapter, and his ingratitude for our Countreys Converſion* 125

Sect. 4. *His continuance of the ſame Fundamental Error, and ſome miſtaking Proofs, That Kings can erect Patriarchates.*

Sect.

Sect. 5. *The* Doctors *Testimonies from Councils and Histories, found to be partly against himself, partly frivolous, and to no purpose* 144
Sect. 6. *The Examination of his Testimonies produced to prove his Fundamental Position, That Kings are supreme in Spiritual Matters* 159
Sect. 7. *Other empty Proofs of his pretended Right, confuted* 169
Sect. 8. *A Reply to the* Doctors *Narrative Confession of his* Schism 178
Sect. 9. *The nature of* Schism, *fetched from its first Grounds; and the material part of it fastned on the Protestants* 193
Sect. 10. *That the reforming Protestants were, and are guilty of the formal part of* Schism 203
Sect. 11. *The* Doctors *Argument, That the Popes power in* England *was derived under the Kings Concession, refuted* 210

The Third Part.

Containing the Answers to the Four last Chapters of Dr. *Hammonds* Schism.

Sect. 1. *His second sort of* Schism, *and his pretence, That they retain the way to preserve Unity in Faith, refuted* 229
Sect. 2. *His evasion in recurring to the first Three hundred years, and concerning the* humble *and* docible *temper of his Church* 245
Sect. 3. *An Examination of some common Notes, produced by the* Doctor, *to particularize his*

Clients, to be no Schismaticks 253
Sect. 4. Of his charitableness in admitting all to his Communion, and our pretended uncharitableness, for refusing to go to their Assemblies 263
Sect. 5. Our pretended uncharitableness in judging, and despising others, retorted upon the Objectors 274
Sect. 6. Our Objection, that the pretended Church of England is now invisible, maintain'd and asserted to be just 299

Down-Derry,

Or Dr. Bramhals, Just Vindication of the Church of England, refuted 305

The

The *Stationer* to the Reader.

THough the entertainment, to which the *Author* invites thee, be almost wholly new, and the Food substantial and solid; yet the Stomach of the Times, seeming quite cloid with *Controversie*, obliged both *him* to quicken thy rellish with a little *Piquant Sauce*, and *me* to tempt thy coy Appetite with this short and drolish

BILL of *FARE*.

1 HOw the *Doctor of Divinity* has forgot his *Accidence* Pag. 7

2 Dr. *Hammond* turn'd a zealous Advocate for *Bastwick*, *Burton*, and *Prynn*'s Ears 16

3 How the Doctor has found *Judas* a Diocess among the Devils; wherein he would have St. *Matthias* succeed him 48

4 How the Doctor has got all the *Apostles* leave to play, except St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*; and, consequently, established the PP. their *Successor*, Universal Pastor 56

5 How the Doctor makes account, there is no *Communion* but in *Eating* and *Drinking* 64

6 The Doctors miraculous gift, in making dumb *Witnesses* speak as he pleases 63, 64, &c.

7 A general Rendevouz of the Doctors Auxiliaries 84

8 The

8 The Doctor brings his *Evidences*, at length, *to a fair Market*, by the unlucky introduction of one blabbing Testimony p. 87
9 The Doctor falls into a sudden fit of *Popery*, too violent for the constitution of many strong Papists 95
10 Well done Doctor 96
11 How Dr *H*: would have all the *Apostles* called *Peter* 101
12 The Doctor winks and fights 113
13 *The properer man the worse luck* 120
14 A comfortable sample of the Doctors *Annotations*, in Folio, *on the Bible* 167
15 How Doctor *H*: will have the allowance of a *House* to dwell in, and *Meat* to eat, the erection of a *Primacy* 172
16 The Doctor constant to his Principles, putting the strongest Argument in the Rear 173
17 The Doctor cryes, he is out of his way, when he comes to a Passage he cannot get over 177
18 How Doctor *Hammond blows* and *sups* all at once 187
19 The Doctor as valiant as Sir *John Falstaff* 211
20 Doctor *Hammonds* two sorts of Gifts, *given* and *not-given* 214
21 How the Doctors ill-favored, *&c.* dashes out the best 221
22 Dr. *H.* like the Fellow that thought the *Sun* set at the next Town 226
23 The Doctors *confusion*, for *Methods* sake 230
24 Dr. *H.* neither goes to Church, nor stays at home 233, *&c.*
25 The Doctors courteous point of Faith, obliging

liging all the Apostles, under pain of Damnation, *to make a leg to St.* Peter 241
26 The Doctors wise appointment of time and place for his Duel, in a Wilderness and a dark night 246
27 A magnanimous piece of *docible humility*, in Dr. *H.* and his Church 251
28 How the world must needs look upon Dr. *Hammond*, as another St. *John Baptist* 254
29 The Doctors Logick, proving Protestants no Schismaticks, because they have all Noses on their faces 270
30 How Dr. *Hammonds* Church keeps open house for all comers 273
31 The Doctor never meddles with any point, but he blunders, and destroys all the Reason that ever concerns it 277
32 The Doctors *Goliahs* sword has no more edg then a Beetle 278
33 Dr. *Hammonds* artificial, incomparable nonsence 286, *&c.*

And for digestion, a solid *Postpast*, under the slight name of *Down-Derry*.

THE

THE Introduction.

IT bred in me at first some admiration, why the Protestant Party, who heretofore seem'd still more willing to skirmish in particular Controversies, then bid battle to the main Body of the Church, or any thing which concern'd her Authority, should now Print Books by Pairs, in defence of their disunion from her, and subducing themselves from her Government. Especially, at this time, when it were more seasonable for the Church of England, (as they entitle themselves) to denounce to those many minute Sects gone out of their Communion, the unreasonableness of their Schism, then plead the reasonableness of their own; and to threaten them with the Spiritual Rod of Excommunication, unless they return, then cry so loud Not guilty, after the lash has been so long upon their Shoulders.

But the Reason of the latter, (I mean why their Pens rather decline to endeavor the

the reducing their own Deserters) I conceive, is, because no colourable pretence can possibly be alleaged by the Protestants, why they left us, but the very same will hold as firm, nay, much more for the other Sects, why they left them. For, that we pressed them to believe false Fundamentals *Dr.* Hammond, *and his Friends will not say, since they acknowledge ours a true Church, which is inconsistent with such a lapse: They were therefore, in their opinion, things tolerable which were urged upon them; and, if not in the same rank, yet more deserving the Church should command their observance, then* Copes *or* Surplisses, *or the* Book of Common-Prayer; *the allowance whereof they prest upon their* Quondam-Brethren.

The Reason of the former, that is, their earnestness at this time to clear themselves from the imputation of Schism, *I conjecture to be the self-consciousness of feeling at length the smart of their own folly, in the present dissipation of their Church, proceeding from their leaving that Body, in which alone is found the healthful vigor of Peace-maintaining Discipline, the want of which causes all their distractions. Yet, not willing to acknowledge an inveterate*

Error

Error, they seek to cover the deformity of their breach, with the veil of innocency; that that which evidently causes their misfortune, may at least seem not to have been their fault.

And indeed, this is the last game they have to play; for after their coy conceit of an Invisible Church *was unmasked, and found plainly to be nothing but a blinde* Chimera, *and less then a* Conventicle: *After that, by consequence, a visible Church was found necessary to perpetuate a line of Successive Governors; without obedience to which, they saw by dear experience all* Order *would be level'd into* Anarchy: *After the consideration of this had oblig'd them to grant, that to raise a* Schism, *or to subtract ones self from Obedience to those Governors, was in a high manner destructive to Gods Church; and therefore a sin deserving the deepest damnation in the abetters and maintainers of it, as also in their voluntary adherents: Lastly, since it was most manifestly acknowledged on all sides, That our Church was that Body of Christianity, in whose Bowels their Predecessors, the first Reformers, were bred; with whom onely, and no other community in the world, before the Rupture was made, they commu-*

nicated.

nicated; and from which Body, by little and little they became, and now are totally disunited; they saw plainly, and Dr. Hammond *will not stick to grant it,* That no Sacrifice remained *to expiate that hainous sin of* Schism, *in the present Protestants, but to wipe off the Aspersion from themselves, and lay the occasion of the breach at the doors of the Catholick Church.*

This is the scope, as far as I understand, of Dr. Hammonds *Book, at which I aym this Answer: Only solicitous, that he was so tedious in things acknowledged by both parties, or which little or nothing concern'd the main point in question, as to make up three parts of his Books of these trifles: And of the very hinge of the Controversie, which is,* When and why the Schism began, *to say so little, and so weakly; that being the chief knot to be untied in this difficulty.*

But, since the Doctor will have it otherwise, I must be content in most of the Book, to Answer meer words, that is, to fight with the air; at least, when any thing occurs, which may seem to have some mixture of a solider element, I shall allow it such a reflexion, as I conceive in Reason it may deserve.

I am his Friend, and will go along with him hand in hand through his whole Book; Not that the solidness of the Treatise it self requires so exact a proceeding, but the weakness of less-understanding Readers, who suspect frivolous things that bear a bulk and a specious shew of Words, to be important, unless the Answerer either out-word them, or manifest them plainly to be impertinent; of which, as the former is far from my intent, so the later must, for the reason alledged, be a part of my present Task, and consequently I hope, a satisfactory Plea for my seeming unnecessary tediousness to the more judicious Reader.

Schism

SCHISM DISARM'D.

THE FIRST PART.

Containing an Answer to the four first CHAPTERS.

SECT. I.

Notes upon Dr. Hammonds first Chapter, of the Danger and Sin of Schism.

HIS first Chapter is most of it a good Sermon like preparative to his enſuing Theme. Who would not think he intended to treat the queſtion in earneſt, ſeeing him begin with ſo ſerious a *Preamble?* In the firſt five Paragraphs there is not a word concerning our queſtion to be taken notice of in quality of a difficulty, being nothing but a moral

Preface, indifferent to either side. Only I desire by way of *Memorandum*, that we may reflect well upon, and bear in mind that vertue of *ready and filial obedience of those under authority, to their lawfully authorized Superiors*; mentioned by him, and extolled for a *vertue of the first magnitude*. And the indifferent Reader will at once both easily discern hereafter, whether the present Catholicks, *who beat the Church*, and believe her in her *Lawfully authoriz'd Governors*, or the first Reformers, who without any, and against all Authority, disobeyed and disbelieved her, have the better title to that *eminent vertue*; and he will also wonder why the Doctor should face his Book with the *Encomiums* of that Vertue, the bare explication whereof applyed to the carriage of the first Reformers, must manifestly condemn them, and quite confute and disgrace all Doctor *Hammonds* laborious endeavours.

Cap. 1. Sect. 4.

But a pretence to a vertue, if confidently carried on, seems to the vulgar an argument of a just claim; and high commendations of it makes the pretence more credible. For who willingly praises, but what is either his own or his friends, or dispraises but what is his enemies. Which makes him in the next three Paragraphs, proceed in the same tenor of *Rhetorick*, and from Scriptures and Fathers paint out the horrid vice of *Schism* in her own ugly shape, as that it is *carnality, self-condemning, contrary to charity, bereaving one of the benefits of prayers and Sacraments; as bad as, and the foundation of all heresies*; that *there is scarce any crime*, (the place cited is absolute, that *there is not any crime*, though he mince it with *scarce*) *so great as Schisme*; nor

Cap. 1 Sect. 6, 7. 8

Sep-

Sacriledg, Idolatry, Parricide, that it is obnoxious to peculiar marks of Gods indignation, Antichristianism, worshiping or serving the Devil; not expiable by martyrdom; it being according to Austin, impossible (though the Dr. mitigates the dangerous expression with, very hard, if not impossible) to receive such an injury or provocation from the Governors of the Church, as may make a separation excusable. And lastly, impossible, according to St. Austin, that there should be any just cause for any to separate from the Catholick Church. Instead of which last words, the Doctor, full of jealousies and fears, puts, the Church truely Catholick, as if there were much danger, lest perhaps any should imagin Christs Church (of which I conceive St. Austin meant it) to be untruly Catholick.

And now, what good, honest, well-minded Reader, not much acquainted with the Doctors manner of Rhetorick, would be so unconscionable as to think him guilty of that vice, which he so candidly and largely sets forth in its own colours; although in those expressions which might too directly prejudice his future work, he seems something chary. And indeed, I wonder for whose sake he hath gathered such a bundle of severe rods out of the sacred Scriptures and the best Fathers, to whip Schismaticks. Such expressions as I hope will strongly incite the Protestant Reader, whom a true care of his eternal good, may invite to seek satisfaction in this point, seriously to consider, that the decision of no one controversie is more nearly concerning his salvation, than this; as appears by the abominable character of Schisme, which the Doctor hath with so much pains deciphered to be an Abridgement of all the most hainous, damnable,

inexcusable, unexplable vices that can be named or imagin'd. Of which *Augean stable*, if Mr. *Hammond* can purge the *Protestant Church*, he shall ever wear the most deserved title of the Reformers *Hercules*. But I am sorry to foresee that the more he handles his work, the more the dirt will remain sticking upon his own fingers.

C. 1: S. 9. He proceeds, or rather infers from the former *Premises*, an irrefragable *Conclusion* (as he calls it, that *the examination of the occasion, cause or motive of any mans Schism is not worth the producing or heeding in this matter.* This (besides the manifest advantage it gives us, of which hereafter) is the prettiest fetch to wave the whole question, and whatsoever is material in it, that I ever met with. That you are excommunicated, or separated from the Communion of our Church (whence, as you say, the *Schism* springs) all the world sees and acknowledges: What remains then to justifie or condemn you or us, but that there was or was not, sufficient cause to cast you out, and deny you Communion? For, that our Church had authority to do it, if you be found to deserve it, being then her subjects or children, none doubts. If then there were no cause, our *Church* was *tyrannical*: If there were, you are truely and properly *Schismaticks*; first, in giving just cause of your own ejection; next, in remaining out of our Church still, and not removing those impediments which obstruct your return.

S. 9. This is most evidently the very point of the difficulty; which, being in great haste, to *shorten your method*, you would totally decline. Make what haste you please, so you take the question along with you: For, assure your self, however

you would avoid it now, you cannot possibly treat it without examining the causes and motives of breaking, as *de facto* you do afterwards. Although, if you can evidence that there is actually no *Schism* made between us, then indeed I must confess there can be no need of examining the causes of a thing that is not: But it is impossible to make this seem *evident*, without putting out ours, your own, and the whole worlds eyes.

But you desire only that *the truth of the matter of fact be look't into, whether the charge of Schism be sufficiently proved, &c.* It is *proved*, Mr. *Doctor*, if you be proved to have so misbehaved your selves within the Church, that, to conserve her Government inviolate, she was forced to outlaw you from her Communion. These are the *motives and causes*, which you (conscious of, and very tenderly sensible in those parts) would have us leave untouch'd. But on this we shall insist more at large when the very handling the question forces you, though unwilling, to touch the *occasions* or *causes* of *Schism*; at least such as you thought fit, and seem'd most plausibly answerable by the notes you had glean'd up and down to that purpose. S. 92.

SECT.

Sect: 2.

Concerning his Notion of Schisme, and the Excommunication of the Church.

His second Chapter begins with the distinction of *Heresie* and *Schisme*; concerning which, what he hath said is true, but yet he hath omitted some part of the truth which was necessary to be told. Wherefore let him but take along with him, that not only *Schisme* is a dissenting from Authority, and *Heresie, an introducing a false doctrine into the Church*; but also
C. 2. S. 1. that all heresie (which it concerns his cause to be willing to pretermit) must necessarily include *Schisme*, and we shall not fall out about this point: For αἵρεσις signifying *electio*, that is, a chusing to one's self some private opinion contrary to the commonly-received Doctrine of the Church, it follows, that by every *Heresie* the Church is truely wounded and rent asunder, the proper effect of *Schisme*. So that, to conserve her self in her primogenial integrity, when shee sees that pertinacity hath throughly and irrecoverably corrupted such a member, she is obliged even in charity, as well as justice to cut it off, *ne pars sincera trahatur*.

C. 2. S. 2. His next Observation is an Eagle-eyed Criticisme about the passive verb αἱρέομαι, which he will have to signifie *reciprocal action, and passion from and upon himself*, and to answer to the Hebrew *Hithpael*; which he tells you, *he could larg-*

ly exemplifie in the use of other words. But first, if we may have leave to criticize upon so acute a Critick, since it is only *for want of conjugations* (as he saies) *designed to supply the place of the Hebrew Hithpael*; how knows he it must necessarily supply that place here? since נשבר and its fellows coming from *perfect actives*, must in the first place have a *signification perfectly passive*; and so, only for *want of Conjugations*, be translated upon occasion to signifie the *neutro-passive*. So that all the Doctors Criticisme (at the best) is come to this, that the Verbe נשבר may be capable of such a signification, in which (though the word did not force it) he was pleased without any end or necessity, but only to shew his art, to take it at this time. Secondly, though in the Hebrew Language the Voyces and Conjugations be jumbled, and therefore the Grammarians admit there eight Conjugations, whereas in reality there is but one, and rather eight Voices, as the said Grammarians affirm; yet it is certain and evident to every School-boy, that in the Latine and Greek Tongues, *Voyces* and *Conjugations* are things distinct, and of a farr different nature. The former alluding chiefly to the *sence* and signification of the word; as appears in our *active, passive, &c.* the latter being taken from some diversitie in the *letters* of the word; which in the *Greek* is the *characteristical letter*, in the *Latine*, some long or short, letter or syllable correspondent, and fit to cause, by a constantly-divers manner of varying a distinction in the Conjugation. Now comes this Doctor of new Grammar, who hath quite forgot his accidence, and tels us, a *passive verbe* must have a *newer signification for*

want

want of Conjugations; as if *vapulo* and *amo* could not be of the same *conjugation*, and yet have a different sence, the one signifying *actively*, the other *neutrally*. Thirdly, if Conjugations will do the deed, that is, make the Verb φίζομαι signifie *neutrally*, I see no reason why the Dr. should complain for want of Conjugations in the Greek Language, there being, more there than in Hebrew. Fourthly, whereas he saith this uice kind of signification is fully *exprest by the Latine neutrals, which partake both of active and passive, but are strictly neither*; I conceive the instances of such verbs, as *sto* and *ardeo* will best fit his purpose; the former signifying either, *I stand*, or, *I am standing*: the latter, *I burn*, or, *I am burning*: and then he need not have run so farre as *Hithpael*, since the first Conjugation *Kal*, more properly challenges such kind of *absolute* or *intransitive* verbs, as appears by עמד *stetit*, which is of that Conjugation. Fifthly, four Latine neutrals, as such, do not signify *reciprocal action or passion from and on himself*, though the Dr. saies they *fully expresse it*; for we say, *Roma ardet*, and yet affirm also that the action of that burning came from *Nero*, and use not to blame *Rome* that it *burnt it self*. Sixthly, the Hebrew *Hithpael*, when it is not coincident with *Kal*, or *Niphal*, (as sometimes it is) signifies an express action upon it self, as fully as two words in Latine or Greek can render it; insomuch as הִתְמַסֵּר expresse, as perfectly, *he delivered over himself*, as in Greek is denoted by παρέδωκε ἑαυτόν, or in Latine by *tradidit seipsum*; and then I would know where the Doctor, among all his critical *observations*, can shew me one Verb in all the Latine or Greek Language to parallel it, or (as the

Doctor

Doctor expresses it; that is of *the nature of Hithpael*. Seventhly, either he meant his Criticisme of the verbal σχίσμα (which seems more likely, it being the word in question) or of the verb σχίζομαι; if, of the former, it is most evident to any man that ever saluted Greek, *à limine*, that those verbals signifie a thing *done*, in a sence as perfectly passive as can be imagined, without relating at all to the person, or any the least intimation whether the *action*, which inferr'd that passion, were performed by himself or some others; as appears by πρᾶγμα, τάγμα, &c. which denote *a work done, an Ordinance constituted*, without reference to the person that *wrought* or *ordained* it. The self-same is visible in our present verbal σχίσμα, which signifies a rupture made; for which reason St. *Pauls* words, ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν, are rendred in the Latin translation, *Audio scissuras in vobis esse*; which scissure or rupture signifies most perfectly *a division made, passively*; not, as the Doctor would have it, *a reciprocal action or passion from and on himself*; since a *rupture* is equally called a *rupture*, whoever it be that makes it. But if the Doctor means the Verb σχίζομαι; then I desire to know where he reads that passives in μαι forming verbals in μα, are used in his sence upon the account of being such passives. Indeed it may happen, and does often, that a Verb in μαι hath a *neuter* signification, and consequently is used in a *neuter* sence; but that σχίζομαι, a Verb perfectly passive, coming from a perfect active (and consequently that all passive Greek verbs) should *be observable to be of the nature* (as he saies) *of the Hebrew Hithpael*, is such an observation as none could ever before discern but Doctor Hammond; who

1 Cor: 11: 18:

who, both here, and all over his Book, by much bending his sight, creates objects at pleasure, or else by an extraordinary faculty sees things that are not; no not even so much as *in their causes*. Lastly, whereas the word was out of controversie between us, and good enough before he medled with it, he has made it by his unnecessary scruing it, speak perfect nonsence; as is manifest by the plain link of consequences which evidently follow out of the nice sence, which maugre all Grammar, he will needs give it. For (that I may be allowed to speak rigorously and critically when I am examining a Criticisme) if it signifie *reciprocal action or passion*, it must signifie an *act* of dividing, exercised *upon himself*, who therefore is the *thing divided*; and since, *divisio est motus ab unitate ad pluralitatem*; *division is a progress or motion from unity to plurality*, its proper and formal effect is to make that which it works upon *more of one*; but that which it works upon (saith the Doctor) is himself the *Schismatick*; therefore it cuts the *Schismatick* in two, and either kils or mangles him, as the *Critick* pleases. See to what a pittifull case the Doctors acuteness hath brought a poor Schismatick, from the too quaint notation of the killing letter of the Hithpael-like verb χίζομαι!

I crave the Readers pardon for transgressing so long upon his patience to lay open a foolery; but I did it to the intent Mr. Dr. and his friends may see how ridiculous, and sometimes unsecure a thing it is to stand shewing ones skill in Grammar, or letting the world see they understand a little Greek and Hebrew, or interlarding their discourse with so many scraps of exotick languages to amuse the vulgar; and in the mean

time

time very little, and very weakly to close with their adversary in the point in controversie with rigorous discourses, solid, pregnant, and convincing reasons, only which (and not Greek and Criticisms) are expected in so grave, and concerning a Treatise. But the former impertinences, with sayings indifferent to both parts, intermingled with some few glean'd citations, and blind stories, sawced with some pretty expressions, sugar'd over with Scripture-phrase, and then dish'd up handsomly with the help of a learned distinction, will serve to make up several paragraphs; Paragraphs, Chapters; Chapters, a Book: *Jamque opus exegi*, &c. and the work is done, which if none thinks worth the pains of a reply (all the substantial part being already confuted an hundred times over, and only the cooking it up changed) presently with the loudest Trumpet of Fame it is proclaimed *unanswerable* (as this book hath been) and hath a solemn triumph sounded in its behalf, whereas only its contemptibleness made it victorious.

But to proceed; all he concludes from his *Criticism* is this, that *Schisme* is a *voluntary recession from the Church*: and might not plain sence have told us this without critically straining and spoiling a word to prove it from Grammar? For, what man in his wits could possibly imagin, *Schisme* being such an horrid *sinne*, that one might perhaps fall into it, whether he would or no, and so become a Schismatick against his will. There needs neither Greek nor Hebrew to understand this: Every child knows by the very first principles of Nature that no man sins, if he cannot help it. Yet Mr. *Hammond* goes on C. 2: S. 2:

a whole leaf, and with most potent Argument overthrows that which would fall of it self (like him that all-to-be-bang'd the dead Bear) not the least hair of an objection bristling it self against him to fright him from his Conquest. He maintains therefore that the actual Excommunication used by the Governors of the Church, is no *the crime of Schisme*; as if he should go about to prove that the sentence of a Judge, when he condemns a murderer or a thief, is neither the sin of murder nor theevery. For *Excommunication* (as all men know) is the Churches condemnation or punishment of the crime of *Schisme*, as the Judges last sentence of death is of the aforesaid delinquencies. Who will not grant him this at the first word? yet nevertheless he will needs prove it with many.

6.2: 8.3. *But Governors* (you say) *being men, may possibly erre, and so censure and excommunicate the innocent.* If what you *say* here, *may be*, you *prove* to *have been*, I shall grant you have acquitted your self well. In the mean time what onely *may be, may also* not *be*; and till such time as you can evidence an immunity from error in the *governed*, as well as pretend a liableness in the *Governors*, the whole economy of the world gives it, that the opinion of right shall stand on the *Governors* side: For surely, the order of the Politick World were a very pitiful slack thing, if every frivolous and probable exception of Subjects, should be held a sufficient cause to break asunder the well-compacted Frame, and dissolve the strongest Nerves of a long-setled *Government*; even in *may-be's*, then you are worsted: What will become of you when we come to demonstrate to you hereafter, that however in

some

some private proofs of a particular fact, the *Governors* may be mistaken, yet in such publick misbehavior, as your few new-fangled Predecessors used, when they opposed themselves to the ever-self-constant Church, it was impossible the *Governors* should be mistaken in judging you to be truly-named Schismaticks, and consequently did well in treating you accordingly.

That there may be *a continuance out of actual Communion without Schism*, as also, *That unjust Excommunication hurts no man*, would have been granted you for one word in plain English, without the citing of so much *Greek* to so little purpose. Onely we desire you would grant us in recompence, what in all reason is due, *That a voluntary continuance in a just Excommunication, makes the thus excommunicated Schismaticks.* Which part of the distinction being counterpois'd to those others you mentioned, *of actual continuance out of the Church, and unjust Excommunication, hurting no man*, and most neerly concerning the Question, being objected by us to be your guilt, whereas the other you treat, are out of controversie between us, it could not stand with the sincere treating a Question, wholly to omit it, and pass it over in silence. But the seeming exactness of your method, can yet easily over-slip that part of the distinction, which sounds dangerously, and is hard to be confuted, though the main of the Question onely stands upon it; and mention onely that which is easily excused, because none objects it, and very facile to be proved, because none denies it. *Scilicet isthuc est sapere.*

C. 2. S. 2, 3, 4.

C. 2. S. 4.

Your other testimonies here alledged, tending

ing

ing onely (as I conceive) to prove; *That unjust Excommunication hurts no man*, are very currant and allowable: And I could have helped you to twenty more as good as these, to the same purpose, some of them in *Greek* too, which would have made a fine show. Your *interpretative Excommunication* runs upon the same strain, and so needs no further Answer, besides that which the following Section affords it.

C. 2. S. 5.

Sect. 3.

Concerning Dr. Hammond's *Plea of a* Weak Conscience, *not suffering him to subscribe to the Churches Doctrine against his present perswasion.*

But now the Doctor hath got a new cloak for his *Schism*, to wit, the pretence of a weak Conscience; which makes him think he ought not to communicate with the Church, but is excused for not-communicating, because the conditions of the Communion contain in them a sin. And what sin should this be, *But to subscribe to things which their Conscience tells them is false: Nay even* (saith the Doctor) *though the truth be on the Churches side, yet really apprehended by him, to whom they are thus proposed to be false, it is hard to affirm that that man can lawfully subscribe*; and therefore rather then do it, the Doctor makes account he may remain out of *Communion*, and that lawfully too.

C. 2. S. 7, 8, 9, 10.

This is the Doctors assertion, which indeed might

might serve out of a Pulpit to an Auditory that he would crave, with giving them that sweet and (as they esteem it) Christian liberty of holding what they list; but to any judicious person that knows what Government is, it is, in reality, the sublimated quintessence of perfect Non-Religion and Anarchy. The Position comes to this, That none should be condemned or punished by his Governors for not-doing that, the contrary whereof he thinks is to be done. To give which Position the least shadow of likelihood, the Doctor is necessarily obliged to prove first, That no Pride, Interest, or Passion can make one think wrong, and consequently culpable in so thinking; which if the Doctor do, he will work wonders, and with a turn of his hand, convert this world of miserable sinners, into a Heaven of pure and perfect Saints.

But let us hear an Argument or two upon the Doctors principles: An ambitious or proud man, blinded by his Passion, begins to think (and really true) that the long established Government of the Commonwealth is tyrannical; and upon this thought, he proceeds to jumble all the Land into intestine Seditions, and to dismount the Governors from the top of Authority, and (as he tells you) *conscientiously too*, that is, *with a perfect persuasion* according to his present Passion. Force him not to *subscribe* to obey his lawful Magistrate, (saith the Doctor) he may not do it lawfully, it is against his Conscience. A revengeful or malicious man thinks that in all right and reason he may endamage the party that offered the affront; and upon the lawfulness of his so doing (while his humor possesses him) he would lay his Soul, *Controle*

him

him not (saith the Doctor,) *he is in an error, but yet governs himself at present according to Conscience, he may not lawfully subscribe,* or seal a pardon, *contrary to his present persuasion.* The Anabaptist thought himself nearly couched in *Conscience,* to cut off the heads of his Mother and Sister for kneeling at the Communion. Urge him not to the contrary (saith the Doctor,) *he cannot lawfully spare them, it is against his present persuasion.* The Puritans (following the Protestants example) refuse obedience to the Church of *England,* seeing in her so many dregs of *Popery* remaining. Unjustly did the Church of *England* (saith the Doctor) in obliging them to her obedience, and cutting off poor *Bastwicks, Burtons,* and *Prynnes* Ears, who did according to their Conscience, or present perswasion. Neither will it avail you to Answer, that these were told by Gods Law, that their acts were unwarrantable, and therefore were culpable: For, it is easie to reply, that you were as much, and as earnestly commanded by God *to hear the Church,* and obey your lawful Superiors; and incurred a far greater sin, if you did not, to wit, the sin of Schism, which your self-unfortunate Pen has out of the *Fathers* described to be a venomous compound, swoln with the mixt poyson of all sorts of Vices.

The Reader will by this see, to what a pass this Doctors Logick would bring the world, if his Position should take place; That no man should be obliged to, or punished for any thing *against his present persuasion,* which he terms *his Conscience.* The contrary to which, that I may a little more elucidate from its first grounds, the Reader may please to consider, *That this pre-*

sent

sent *perswasion*, which a man is so fixt in, may either begin in the Understanding, or proceed from the Will: If in the Understanding, it must be onely a perfect demonstration that can beget in it so firm an adherence; and then, being rational, it is not onely excusable, but laudable: Otherwise it is an irrational resolvedness sprung from a passionate distortion of the interessed Will; pushing and exciting the *Understanding* without due deliberation first to push upon, and afterwards pertinaciously to adhere to a thing, more then the light of *Reason* it self gives. Which being in the Will vicious, is consequently (as all other Vices are) culpable, liable to correction, and by correction reformable. So as, *Licet non possumus opinari quando volumus*, that is, Although we cannot deem or think a thing true, but we must have some Motive or other, true or false, why we think so, yet with this it well consists, that a perverse affection in the Will, may blinde and lead astray the Understanding, by proposing false Motives for true ones. And therefore when the Will by deserved punishment is whipt out of her viciousness, the Native lustre of the Understanding will quickly disenvelop it self from the cloud of mistake, in which the Passion-exhaled vapors had enwrapt her.

You see then, Doctor, (which perhaps you never reflected on before,) A man may be obliged to retract a *present perswasion*, and (however he pretends Conscience for his excuse) be punished too, if he does not, since his bad will was the cause of his erroneous judgment, as the cases of the fore-mentioned Malefactors, your Clients, have, as I hope, by this time

better informed you. But perhaps you would not have this method used in matters of Religion: And why not? Unless the violating the ever-sacred Authority of Christs Church, and renouncing the main support of all Religion, the Rule of Faith, (things in the conserving of which, the eternal salvation of mankinde consists) be less deserving punishment in the offenders, or less worth taking notice of by the Governors of the Church, then the wrong of thirteen-pence-half-penny is by the Laws and Governors of the Commonwealth.

C. 2, S. 12. The result then of your discourse comes to this, That all your dwindling *supp-fittons* and *may-bees*, (which you wisely put down for proofs, and sometimes for grounds) remain still in question, or rather unquestionably unsupposable. Your tenderness of Conscience not to sin against God in *subscribing to the errors* (forsooth) *of his Church*, which he hath commanded you to hear, onely Pharisaical arrogancy and singularity in you, which makes you think and style at pleasure any thing *Error*, which the whole Church holds, if contrary to your private judgment: Lastly, Our pretended making Communion impossible, will be found to be onely a self-opinionated pride in you, and of all prides the most miserable and silly, to adhere so pertinaciously against *Evidence of Authority* to a few obscure scraps of writers speaking on the by, and your own self acknowledged fallibility. All these, and whatever pretence you here insinuate, will all lie at your doors, and loudly call you Schismaticks, unless you can evidence, with most perfect demonstrations, that those things were *Errors* which the Church obliged

C. 2. S. 7, 8, 9, 10.

obliged you to subscribe to; that is, that the Churches doctrine was, or is erroneous, and consequently her self not infallible. This, if you evidence, I shall grant you have not onely overthrown ours, but all Religion; not onely acquitted your self of Schism, but also quite taken away all possibility of being a Schismatick; since no Authority can with any face or conscience, oblige to a belief, of which her self is not certain.

But, I doubt not, you make your self sure of the conquest, not apprehending any but Saints and Angels in Heaven, and God himself, to be infallible. To which you adde, of your own invention, impeccable; as your custom is, never to speak of our Tenet, without the disgraceful addition of some forged calumny or other imposed upon us. But that none else should be infallible except those you mention, is much wonder. I thought the Apostles had been also infallibly assisted, when they pen'd the sacred Writ, and preach'd the Gospel: I thought also our Saviour when he sent them to teach, and promised them his assistance, had said, He would remain with them always, even till the end of the world; that is, with the succeeding Church. I thought there had been some means to be infallibly certain, that such and such Books were Gods Word, and genuine Scripture, without an Angel, Saint, or Christs coming from Heaven, or the Doctors private spirited opinion, which he will call, God. Neither do I doubt, but the Doctor himself will grant it impossible, That all the Protestants in England should be fallible or mistake, in witnessing whether twenty years ago, there were Protestant Bishops, or no; and C. 2. S. 6.

that such was the *Tenet*, and Government of their Church at that time: Yet a thousand times greater evidence have we of the indefectibility of the Churches Faith, and her infallibility. As you may to your amazement see (if you will but open your eyes) in that incomparable Treatise of *Rushworth's Dialogues*, vindicated from all possible confute, by that excellent *Apology* for it, writ by the learned Pen of Mr. *Thomas White*, in his Friends behalf, whose *Dialogues* he set forth, enlarged, and defended against your acute Friends, *Faulkland* and *Digby*: Persons who did not use to treat Controversies in such a dreaming shallow way, as it hath been your misfortune to do here; nor stand *Preaching* to their adversary, when they should *Dispute*. To these *Dialogues*, and their *Apology*, I refer you, that you may know what to do; if you confute them solidly, and demonstrate plainly, That our Church is liable to Error, you will eternally silence us, and clear your selves. But take heed you bring not whimpering probable *may-be's*, and onely-self-granted suppositions for proofs; These might serve your turn in your first Book, which might hope for the good fortune to scape without answering; but in your second, and after you are told of it, it will fall short of satisfactory.

C.2: §.5. Remember, Mr. *Hammond*, that you granted a *chearful obedience and submission of your judgements and practices to your Superiors*, under penalty of *not being deemed true Disciples of Christ*. If this be real (as I wish it were) then what easier condescension and deference to the judgment of Superiors can be imagined, then to submit one's private judgment, when he has onely probability

bility to the contrary? *Evidence* therefore, demonstrable *evidence* you must give in, of the Churches erring, ere your pretence, that you were obliged by her to subscribe to Errors, can take place, and so excuse you from *Schism*. But as your profession of the obligation you have, to submit your judgment to the Church, renders your probable Reasons insufficient to fall to judge her; so (God be praised) your own self acknowledged *fallibility* will secure us from the least fear of your *Demonstrations*. Yet unless you do this, you undo your cause; for if the Church could not erre, she could need no reforming. So that your Preaching of Reformation is vain, your Faith vain; and by consequence your selves Schismaticks, and an Act more.

SECT. 4.

Concerning the ground of Unity, groundlesness of Schism, and of Dr. Hammonds *manner of arguing to clear himself of the later.*

ALL that is material in the Doctors second Chapter, is sum'd up in these two heads, that the Church does ill in obliging men to subscribe against *their present perswasion*; and, That the Church which they left, was erroneous, and so obliged them to the subscription of Errors. Upon these two notes, as on a base-ground he runs division all along this Chapter; repeating them so often in each Paragraph, that I was

forced to omit my intended method at present; not making a Counter-sermon to each in order, but bringing together his dispersed Doctrine into Heads, and then confuting them; not doubting, but the Leaves and Branches, which counterfeit some small flourish of devotion, will quickly fade into Hypocrisie, when the sapless roots are pluckt up from their rotten ground. The former of them hath been discovered in the former Section, to be worse then weak; his manner of arguing from the second, shall be laid open in this.

But, because I perceive Mr. *Hammond* very much unacquainted with our grounds, why our Church obliges her sons to rest in her belief, and continue in her Communion, thinking her (doubtless) very discourteous, that will not let her subjects in civility (as the modest and moderate Church of *England* does) hold and do what they list, I will at present undeceive him somewhat in that point, having a better occasion to do it more largely hereafter. First, The Doctor stumbles much, and (as Ignorance is ever the Mother of admiration) winks Master Knot's *Inference very strange, that the Church is infallible, otherwise men might forsake her Communion.* Whereas, on the contrary, I not onely think it *strange to infer* otherwise, but as great an absurdity as can be imagined; for why may not men forsake the Communion of the Church, if they may forsake her Doctrine (since it is impossible to preserve the former, if he renounce the latter;) and why may they not forsake her Doctrine, if she have no Power nor Authority to tie them to the belief of it, and how can she have any Authority to binde them to the belief of

C. 2. S. 6.

of it, if she her self knows not certainly, whether it be true or no; that is, be not *infallible*: Or what man living (who hath so much wit as to raise or understand the difficulty) can possibly so degenerate from Reason, which is his nature, as to submit it, in believing things above his Reason, and which concern his eternal Salvation, upon such an Authority, as may perhaps lie, and, so damn him for believing her, since, *Without true Faith it is impossible to please God.*

Hence follows by an inevitable consequence, that, since the Church pretends, and hath ever pretended to have a Promise from *Christ* of a perpetual assistance from Error, if *Christ* have made good that promise, that is, if she be *infallible*, then her obliging her sons to rest in her Faith, is most plainly evidenced, to be charitable, just, and necessary: because in that case it were both mens obligation, and also their greatest good to believe so qualified a Mistress: Whereas, on the other side, any other Congregation that professes her self fallible, that is, uncertain of the truth of her Doctrine, cannot without accusing her self of the greatest *injustice* and *tyranny* in the World, binde others to the belief of the said Doctrine: For, it carries the prejudice of the highest unreasonableness with it; for a man to tell me, *I will force you to believe that, which yet I my self know not whether it is to be believed, or no.* Let not Dr. *Hammond* then blame our *Church* for obliging men to subscribe to her Doctrine, unless he can *evidence* first, That she hath not that, which she hath ever from the beginning of the *Church*, pretended to; to wit, a security from *fallibility*

by the perpetual assistance of her *Spouse* and *Saviour*. But rather let him invent, if he can, any rational excuse for his own *Church*, which professing her self *fallible*, and so wanting all power to oblige to belief, would notwithstanding have others believe her, accounting the *Puritans*, *Anabaptists*, *Presbyterians*, and *Independants*, *Schismaticks* if they do not; and dares enstyle her self a *Church*, that is, a *Commonwealth* which hath power and means to oblige to *Vnity in belief*, whereas, her own professed fallibility or uncertainty, evidences, that she wants all the Nerves which should connect the Members of such a Body.

These grounds laid, it were not amiss to insert here, what the Author of that Epistle which was writ from *Brussels*, in answer to Dr. *Hammond*, saith upon this place. "By this (saith he) "you may perceive much of his discourse to be not "onely superfluous and unnecessary, but contrary to "himself; for he laboreth to perswade, That the "Protestant may be certain of some truth, against "which the Roman Catholick Church bindeth to "profession of Error; which is as much as to say, "That he who pretends to have no infallible Rule, "whereby to govern his Doctrine, shall be supposed to "be infallible, and that he who pretends to have an "infallible Rule, shall be supposed to be fallible; at "most, because fallible Objections are brought against "him. Now then consider what a meek and humble C. 2. "son of the Church (as this Dr. would be thought) S. 10. "ought to do, when on the one side is the Authority "of Antiquity, and Possession (such Antiquity and "Possession without dispute, or contradiction from "the Adversary; as no King can shew for his "Crown, and much less any other person for any

"other

"other thing) together with the perswasion of In-
"fallibility, and all the pledges Christ hath left to
"his Church for motives of Union: On the other
"side, uncertain Reasons of a few men pretending to
"Learning, every day contradicted by incomparable
"numbers of men wise and learned; and those few
"men confessing those Reasons, and themselves uncer-
"tain, fallible, and subject to Error: Certainly,
"without a byass of interest or prejudice, it is im-
"possible to leave the Church, if he be in it, or not
"return if he be out of it. For, if infallibility be
"the ground of the Churches power to command
"belief, as she pretends no other, no time, no sepa-
"ration within memory of History, can justifie a con-
"tinuance out of the Church. Thus far that Let-
ter; which, had it not been strangled in the birth, and miscarried in the Printer's hand, might have saved me the labor of this larger confute; and, being exactly short, might justly be styled Dr. *Hammonds Iliads in a Nut-shell*; since the force of it was so united, the Reason in it so firmly connected, as might have cost the Doctor a full *ten years siege*, ere he could make a *breach* into it with his *Brown-Paper Bullets*.

But now it is high time to reflect upon the Doctors manner of arguing; who tells us here, That *he needs give no more answer to our objection of a Schismatical departure, then this, That they who acknowledge not the Church of Rome to be Infallible, may be allowed to make a supposition which is founded in the possibility of her inserting Errors in her Confessions*, &c. And so goes on with three or four Suppositions, all built upon that first general Supposition, That *the Roman Catholick Church* hath erred, or is not *infallible*. I com-

C. 2: S. 12:

mend the Doctor for his wit. The whole question is reduced to this one point, Whether the *Church* erred or no; as is most manifest: For if she evidently erred, he and his Ancestors may possibly be excused for not believing her, and rejecting her Government by *Schism*, which she told you was sacred; but if she was *infallible*, no plea nor evasion can possibly serve your turn; neither is it your, or their supposing it, which can make her *fallible*, and so be a fit ground to build your excuse on. Now comes this Gentleman, who in the first page of his Book is entitled *Doctor of Divinity*, to handle this Question; and onely desires in courtesie, that the main matter in controversie (out of which it was easie to infer what he pleased) should first be supposed or granted, and that upon that ground he would evince his cause. Just like that young smatterer in Logick, who undertook to prove his fellow a Goose; but first he would needs have him suppose, that whatsoever had two Legs, was one of those tame Fowl; which his wary fellow, notwithstanding his importunity, refusing to grant, he was left quite blank, and his wise Argument at an end. Such is the onset, such must be the event of the Doctors Logick: You and your first Reformers, are *Schismaticks* (says the *Catholick*) in rejecting the Government of the *Church*, and her chief Pastor, which she told you was both lawful and sacred. Your *Church* erred (saith the Doctor) and so we could not be obliged to believe her. I but (answers the *Catholick*) you must first prove evidently, that she is *fallible*, and subject to Error. Oh (replies the Doctor) we suppose that to be most certainly true, and without all dispute. *Risum teneatis amici!*

Yet

Yet Mr. *Hammond* hath involved another Error in the same passage more unpardonable (if possible) then the former, so fruitful is his Logick of inconsequent absurdities. For what man ever arrived to that heigth of mistake, as to endeavor to manifest his innocency by the voluntary confession of a crime, which implies the objected fault, and much more to boot; or to alledge for his plea against the accusation of his adversary, that which more deeply condemns, and is objected to him as a far more heinous crime by the same adversary? Yet such is this Doctors acuteness. He is accused by us of Schism, and lays for the ground of his excuse, That he acknowledges not our *Churches infallibility*, which is charged upon him, not onely to be both *Schism* and *Heresie*, but as the very sink of all *Infidelity*. For what man of Reason, but stands in an hovering disposition of minde to embrace any Religion, or rather Irreligion, nay even Turcism it self (as your best Champion, the Lord *Faulkland* professes he would) when a stronger blast of a more probable Reason, shall turn the sail of his Wind-Mill Judgment; knowing and acknowledging (as he must, and does) That neither his own private interpretation of Scripture, nor the Church he is in, is *infallible*, or secured from Error by any promise of *Christ*. In his *Reply*, p. 241.

The denying this Infallibility therefore, (Mr. Doctor) is the greatest crime we charge you with; but you (free of your Suppositions) suppose it your chief virtue, and put it for the ground of all your excuse. In this Infallibility is founded all the power of the *Church* obliging to belief, the inviolableness of her

Government,

Government, the unjustifiableness of any Schism, the firm security, that Faith is certain, and lastly, whatever in the *Church* is sacred. The Doctor therefore in clearing himself, by denying the Infallibility of the *Church*, does the self-same, as if some discontented subject having first out-lawed himself, by denying the Laws, and rejecting the Government of *England*, and afterwards becoming obnoxious to those Laws by Robbing, Murthering, *&c.* should endeavor to plead, *Not guilty*; by alledging, That though indeed the English Subjects, who accept the Laws, and allow the Government of *England*, are liable to punishment, if they offend against them: Yet I (saith he) who suppose this Government Tyrannical, and these Laws unjust, especially, *having a present perswasion, and thinking in my Conscience they are so*, cannot be obliged to keep them; and therefore must not be accounted a factious man, nor be liable to punishment, if I break them.

What will become of this malefactor, Master Doctor? your Logick clears him: But, the Reader, and I am perswaded, wiser judgments will think him more highly deserving the Gallows, for refusing subjection to the Laws and Government, and you more deeply meriting Excommunication for rejecting the *Churches Infallibility*, the onely ground of her Authority, then for all the rest of your particular faults which issue from that false principle. But it is pretty to observe, how the Doctor never clears himself from *Schism*, upon any other grounds then those, which, if admitted, would prove all the Malefactors in the World innocent; and make it lawful, nay, an obligation in Conscience

to

to dissolve the whole Fabrick of the Worlds Government. So true it is, That the very position of a *Fallibility* of Faith first lays, and in time hatches the Cockatrice Eggs of both *Atheism* and *Anarchy*.

Sect. 5.

Containing some Observations upon Mr. Hammonds *third Chapter, of the Division of* Schism.

When I had perused his third Chapter, with intent to see what it might contain worth the answering, finding scarce any thing which made either against us, or for him, I thought I had mistaken the Title of his Book; but looking back, I found it to have indeed this Inscription; Of Schism. A Defence of The Church of England, Against The Exceptions of The Romanists; By H. Hammond, D. D. So that now I remain'd satisfied what was the Title, but much more unsatisfied to find my expectation so totally deluded; and that in a large Chapter containing thirty six pages (almost a full quarter of the Book) not five words were found which touched the question directly, nor could in any way be a preparative to it. So as we have here 66 pages of 182. well towards half the Book) premised by the Doctor to introduce the Question; like the *Mindian* Gate,

too

too large an entrance for so narrow a Corporation.

Frivolous then had been the long *Preamble* of this Chapter, had it been to the purpose, and tended to the Question; but if it be found nothing at all to the *Question*, but to wave and conceal the main, and indeed sole matter which concerns it; nay more, to have prevaricated from the very scope for which he would seem to intend it; then I will leave it to the Reader to imagin what commendations this *Chapter* and its *Author* doth deserve.

Our Question is of *Schism*: In this Chapter he undertakes to shew the several sorts of it; C. 2. S. 3, 4, 5. which therefore he divides into *Schism against Fraternal Charity*, and *Schism* against some one particular *Governor*; as in the *People against a Priest or Deacon*, in those against a *Bishop*, in *Bishops* against their *Arch-Bishops*, in *Arch-Bishops* against their *Primate or Patriarch*; and there he stops; lest, if he had ascended a step higher to the Authority of the Pope, he should have said more truth then will serve his turn. For you must know he has a deep design against Antichrist; and is resolved that half a score old stories, or some few words and unwarrantable practices of discontented persons (especially, being cited in Greek) shall utterly overthrow him; in despite of manifest practice of Antiquity, clouds of testimonies from Fathers, and the Doctrine of the *Catholick Church*, of whose fallibility he is far from even pretending to any *infallible Evidence*.

But that we may manifest what we laid to his charge, that all this long *Chapter* is but waste-paper, the Reader may please to take notice that

that the *Schism* we charge the Protestants with, is not of the peoples *Schism* against a *Deacon* or *Presbyter*; nor of a *Deacon* or *Presbyters Schism* against a *Bishop*, nor any link in that chain of *Schisms* which he there enumerates; but we accuse them and their Fore-Fathers, the first Reformers.

First, of a *Breach* or *Schism* from the *whole Catholick Church*. This is without controversie the *Schism of Schisms*; and which in the first hearing of the word (*Schism*) objects it self to our understanding, as being simply, properly, & κατ' ἐξοχὴν such; whereas the other are nothing but particular refractory disobediences in comparison of this; and may well consist with your obedience to the *Universal Church*. This, this, I say, is the chief and main *Schism* we impute to his fellow Protestants; yet the Doctor in his present Book entituled, *Their Defence from Schism*, takes no notice of the chief thing he ought to clear them of; will not have it come into play, nor allow it a place in his Division, as if it were either none at all, or else such a slight one as was not worth taking notice of. Strange! that he could use such prolixity in *trifling Schisms* impertinent to the present discourse, and not afford the least mention to the *greatest Schism of all*, when the scope and aim of *his Chapter* necessarily required it, and the *Question* forcibly exacted it. Strange! that he could remember even the peoples *Schism* against a *Deacon* or *Presbyter*, and forget that which breaks from the whole body of the Universal Church. But the Doctor is more carefull to preserve his own *Copy-hold* then the *Churches Free hold*; for, according to his division

sion and Doctrine in this *Chapter*, his Parishoners would be *Schismaticks* for disobeying him, or a puny *Deacon*; but neither he, nor the *Deacon Schismaticks* at all for disobeying the whole *Church*. And thus the Dr. has establish-ed his own Authority to be more inviolable then the Popes, and by this one Division, has quite conquered and got the upper-hand of *Antichrist*.

Secondly, What is become of General Councils all this while? Have not they as great an Authority as any private *Patriarch*, *Primate*, *Arch-Bishop*, *Bishop*, Dr. *Hammond*, or a *Deacon*? Far greater sure, if I be not mistaken. Doubtless then a Schismatical rejecting their Decrees and Authority, is more hainous, grievous, and more worthy to be ranked amongst his fellow-Schisms then any of the others. Yet of this, in this *Chapter* where he expressly undertakes and professes to enumerate all the several sorts of *Schism*, we hear not a syllable.

Thirdly, What is become of Schism against the Head of the *Church*? Is not the *Papal Authority* greater then the Authority of any *Patriarch*, *Primate*, *Arch-Bishop*, *Bishop*, Dr. *Hammond*, or a *Deacon*? Surely all imagin so, but Dr. *Hammond* and his fellows; why is this over-slipt then, as if it were a matter of nothing? But Dr. *Hammond* will answer, That the Popes is not indeed an Authority, but an Usurpation, and therefore there can be no *Schism* against it: To which I reply, That I expect not that he should grant it here, but since he knows very well and grants that the *Papal Authority* was in a long possession of this Island, held and acknowledged then, and still pretended to be sacred, and of

divine

divine institution; nay more, since it is confessed by them, that they rejected this Authority, and that this rejection of it is objected to them by us, as a far greater *Schism* than any of the other he mentions, he ought at least have taken notice of it, and shown in what degree of Schism the casting off such an Authority was to be reputed (as being Chief, and instituted by Christ) unless he could manifest the pretended Authority of the Hope to be null, and an Usurpation. Moreover, since it is the use of the multitude, which makes words signifie; and that three parts of four of those who bear the name of Christians (if taken in the double extent or space, both of time and place) have acknowledged, and called it a main Schism, and greater then any the Doctor here reckons up, to reject the Supream Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, the Doctor could not in reason avoid the mention of this so-commonly-called *Schism*, unless he had first manifested that it was none. Again, to state the matter indifferently to both sides, let us take the word, *Head of the Church*, as abstracted from an *Ecclesiastical* or *Secular Governor*, that is from both *Pope*, and *Emperor* or *King*; nay, if he pleases, let us take it only in the later sence, which is his; I desire to know, since the *Emperor* or *King*, is (according to him) *Supreme* in *Ecclesiastical* affairs, *Head* of the *Church* or *Churches* in his Dominions, above *Patriarchs*, and *Primates*, &c. why is not the denying this Authority a greater *Schism* even in his own grounds, than a *Schism* against a *Patriarch*, *Deacon?* &c. For, the Authority of the Head rejected, what means possible remain to reconcile and unite the members. In omitting this

therefore, the Doctor hath neither been true to our Question, nor his own Grounds. In sum, So wise a Logician is this Doctor of Divinity; That whereas the Members of the division should adequately comprehend all the several sorts of the thing divided; he has onely omitted the three principal *Schisms* against Government, and those not onely principal in themselves, but also solely importing the present Controversie; and onely mentioned those, which were not objected, and so nothing at all concerning our Question.

Where, I desire the Doctor to remember, That all those Testimonies he hath huddled here together out of the Fathers against *Petty-Schismaticks*, will light far heavier upon him, and his fellows, if they be found to have separated from the incomparably greater Authority of the whole Church; and that not onely by a bare *Schism*, but also (which you here acknowledge to adde very much to the guilt of the former,) by an open and most manifest *Sedition*.

S. 9.

The rest of your Chapter is taken up in things which tend not at all to the Matter you purposed to handle, that is, *To defend your Church against the Schisms we object*; which makes you also so ample, and large in handling them. You show therefore with a great deal of pains, the particular dignities of *Deacons*, *Priests*, *Bishops*, *Arch-bishops*, *Primates*, *Patriarchs*; you tell us many things of the * Seven Churches of *Asia*, &c. I will onely glean what may seem worth Animadversion, treating it briefly, because you speak it (as you say) *by the way*, *in passing*, and the question is not much concerned in it;

C. 3. S. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24. * C. 3. S. 15, 16, 17.

and

and omiting those Testimonies which are slightly objected here, and come over and over again afterwards.

First then you affirm, That the *Roman Patriarchy* extended not it self to all *Italy*; which, though a known untruth, and which I have heard learned, and unpassionate men of your own side acknowledge; yet you will needs evince out of the obscure Testimony of one *Rufinus*, a discontented, silly, and barbarous Writer; and if you blame me for excepting against him, one of your late most extolled Writers, Monsieur *Daille* shall defend me; who characters *Rufinus* to be *An arrant Wooden statue, a pitiful thing; one that had scarce any reason in what he said, and yet much less dexterity in defending himself*; yet you account here his Testimony very *competent*. But how small soever the Popes Patriarchy be, what is this to his Papal Authority, since even we our selves acknowledge him a Private Bishop of *Rome*, which yet prejudices not his Publick Authority, as the Churches Universal Governor. S. 17. Mr. *Daille*, l. 2. c. 4.

Your Testimony alleaged out of the Council of *Chalcedon*, shall be answered hereafter, when we come to discuss the Question of the Popes Authority; as also your other out of the Council of *Ephesus* in its proper place, where it is repeated. C. 3. S. 22. See afterwards Part. 2. C. 3. S. 25

Your other claw against the *Pope*, is, That there was none anciently above the *Patriarchs*, but the Emperor, which you think to evince, because the Emperor made use of his secular Authority in gathering Councils. And who denies, but however the intention and ordering that great Affair belonged to the *Popes*, yet C. 3. S. 22

the Emperors, as being Lords of the world, were fittest to command the execution of it. But ere you can conclude hence against the *Popes Authority* over the Church, you must first evince, That the Emperors (and the like may be said of Kings) did this without the *Pope* signifying such their desires to them. Next, That, if they did it sometimes against the *Popes* will, or pretending it their proper power, such an action or pretence of theirs was lawful. And thirdly, had it belonged to the Emperors (which yet none grants you) yet how will your consequence hold good, That therefore the *Pope* hath no Authority over the Universal Church? As if there were no other acts of an Universal Authority, but to gather Councils; which is all one as to say, That the Kings of *England* could have no Universal Temporal Command or Jurisdiction in *England*, but onely to call a *Parliament*. All your Marginal Testimonies therefore, which you here bring (signifying no more to us, But that the Emperor executed that business) are far from making good the Position you alleage them for; to wit, That the Emperors did it by their own proper *Power*.

SECT.

Sect. 7.

Of Doctor Hammond's *advance towards the Question, in the beginning of his Fourth Chapter.*

THe Doctor having so wisely and securely laid his Grounds, that is, Having omited all Grounds that might either preiudice his Cause, or touch the Question, advances at length towards the Controversie it self; but with the same reeling pace as formerly: In which, he continues throughout the whole progress of this Chapter with such a rambling career, as if what he had said hitherto, were but preparatives to absurdness, or but nonsence in jest; which here, being come to the point, he more exactly performs in earnest. Which, if my Answer to this Chapter do not plainly demonstrate, I will submit my self willingly to be branded by the Readers censure for a most unjust Calumniator: But if it do, then let him think of Mr. *Hammonds* manner of proceeding, and his cause, as they shall be found to deserve.

And first, stumbling at the Threshold, he expects that the Church should produce evidence for her own, or her supreme Head's Authority in *England*. Which, since it is confessed by all sides, That the Pope was in quiet possession of such a *Primacy*, it no more belongs to us to prove just, then it doth to the Emperor, who had derived the succession of his right *C. 4. S. 1.*

from a long train of Ancestors, to evidence his title to the Kingdom ere he can punish a Rebel. It is wonderful the Doctor should be ignorant of that which all the world knows and acknowledges, to wit, That a long setled possession is of it self a proof, until the contrary be evinced; so as he who should deny the Authority of such an Emperor, were truly and properly a seditious person; and you, for the same Reasons, truly and properly Schismaticks, unless he can produce sufficient, that is, evident Causes and Reasons, why he refused obedience to that Emperor; and you, why you denied subjection to the Pope; who (as you were told before) was not less found in a quiet and long-acknowledged possession of *Primacy* in *England*, nay, much more then any Emperor or King in Christendom was of his Crown; to wit, even by your own grants, for the space of eight or nine hundred years. Neither imagin that the Modern Protestants, who finde the Pope outed from his Jurisdiction in *England*, are therefore excusable from their Fore-fathers *Schism*: For, however changeableness of humane affairs, and pretence, that Temporal Laws were constituted, and are disannulable by men, may render such rights and titles obnoxious to alienation or alteration; and so cause a defeazance of any obedience formerly due to a secular Governor: Yet, if Christ himself hath constituted any Authority, and enjoyned obedience to it, no length of time, no vicissitude of secular Affairs, nor intercession of humane Laws can ever disoblige from this duty. So that, it lies still as freshly as at the first breach encharg'd upon the Protestants, under the pen alty

penalty of *Schism*, to manifest with most convincing and undeniable Arguments, that the Pope could never claim any such Authority from Christ.

Which claim of ours, and (as the Doctor will have it) our *first evidence*, he goes about to confute in this Chapter. But, first, in big terms he layes out an ample Narration, how King *Henry* the Eighth, the *Universities*, and *Parliament*, not onely said, but testified under their Hands and Seals, nay, more (saith the Doctor) took their Corporal Oaths on it, that the Pope was not Head of the Church; and, *All this* (saith Mr. *Hammond*) *is looke on and condemned as an act of Schism in this Church and Nation.* What a piece of wit is here! This is the very thing for which we accuse your Church and Nation of *Schism*; and you, by a bare Narration that it was done, think (it seems) to have half proved it was lawfully done. And *all this*, said, seal'd, and sworn by a King, Parliament, and Universities, is enough to amaze a vulgar-headed Reader into a belief, That their Votes could not be other then true. And I doubt not, but the Doctor himself wonders, That the whole Catholick Church should be so unreasonable, as not to grant and think her self ever to have taught, and the whole world ever to have believed a lie, rather then to judge so uncharitably, That a lustful and tyrannical King, with some number of his Subjects, partly out of flattery, partly out of fear, adhearing to him (though these not a handful in comparison of the even-then-present Christian World) should say, seal and swear a falshood: Especially, the cause of the breach be- C. 4: S. 2.

ing most notorious to the whole world, not to have been Conscience, but vicious and unlawful pretences: And, on the other side, multitudes of conscientious and learned men opposing it; and many laying down their deareſt lives in testimony of the contrary truth; whose taking the Affirmative upon their deaths, is more to be believed, then the other true, taking it upon their Corporal Oaths. Among those who died in defence of the Popes Supremacy, was our renowned and worthy Countryman, Sir *Thomas More*; whose esteem for Piety, Learning, and Prudence, as the King professed, was so eminent, That his subscription alone, if it could be procured, was worth half the Realms. Yet this so notorious acting and commencing of *Schism* (though sprung from unlawful lust, and managed with most cruel tyranny) the Doctor seems to think so laudable, that the very mentioning it will something conduce to justifie a Schismatick. *All this* (saith he) *is looked on and condemned, as an act of Schism in this Church and Nation!*

C. 4. S. 3. Next he proceeds to state the Question, by branching the Objection into many parts; which the Doctor will needs have belong to us *to manifest ere the Objection will have any force.* So as, possession beyond memory is of *no force* with him, which yet is the *basis* of all the firm peace this poor world enjoys, and the ground upon which every man remains quietly instated in his own. When such a possession is once setled, all Controversies are silenced; when it is question'd, a gap is open'd to all litigiousness. Necessity therefore, and evidence, must both be pleaded, ere any one can justly quarrel with

with this *Nurse* of Peace. Yet the Church must plead her Evidence (saith the Doctor,) that is, Seem to bring in question her own long-possessed Title; and at whose Bar (think you) must she plead it? At no other then that of her *quondam* Sons and Subjects; and now, Rebels and Enemies.

But the Doctor, most unfortunately accurate in his Divisions, tells us, That we *must manifest first*, the matter of fact, that thus it was in *England*. *Secondly*, *The consequence of that fact, that it were Schism, supposing those Successors of Saint Peter were thus set over all Christians by Christ.* As for the first, The Reader, I doubt not, will smile at the Doctors folly, in telling us, we are to manifest that which no man living ever denied; and which himself immediately before, and far more largely hereafter, relates and acknowledges. For, who ever imagin'd it a matter of Controversie, *needing to be manifested*, Whether or no King *Henry* the Eighth denied the Popes Supremacy. The second is yet more ridiculous then the former; since not even the most impudent Heretick in the World ever had the face to deny, but that, if the Popes Universal Authority was constituted by Christ, the consequence was inevitable, That it was both *Schism* and *Heresie* to reject and condem it, as he confesses they did. Yet is this *the second thing* (saith he) *which we must manifest ere the Objection will be of any force.* But, to make the jest compleat, after telling us, That we are to manifest them; he, out of his courtesie, and *to expedite the matter*, is pleased *to grant them, not requiring the pretenders farther to prove them.* As if he could have resisted them, but had done

* C. 7. S. 5.

us

us a great favor, in saving us from a most disgraceful foil we should have sustained, in maintaining, That a fact was done, which himself and all the world acknowledges; and in being puzzled with proving, that what Christ bid us do, was to be done, and the Authority instituted by God himself, to be obeyed. To what purpose was it to bring such unnecessary and frivolous distinctions, and afterwards wave them? But the Doctor (as I have shown before, and shall demonstrate more largely hereafter) hath a most special gift of his own, in dividing his Text; and he must upon all, or rather no occasion, show it. Which trick of his, though it counterfeit an order, and breed an apprehension of a methodical exactness in discourse to ordinary Readers; yet when it shall be discovered to tend to no solidity, being like the Philosophers dividing of *Spatium imaginarium*; all men will see plainly it is but a meer knack to be-wonder Children and Ignorants.

Sect. 7.

Of Doctor Hammonds *first Evidence against St.* Peters *Universal Pastorship.*

But now the Question is stated; this Chapter is to prove no Donation of any Primacy to St. *Peter* by Christ; the next, That no such Authority is devolv'd upon the Pope, his

his Successor, in the See of *Rome*. And now the long-expected time of the Doctors Evidences is come: I told you he had a horrible design in Lavander against the Pope; now truth is come to light. This, this is the fatal time that the Horns of the Beast in the *Apocalypse* must be broken, and the Walls of that *Whorish-Babylon* thrown down by the inevitable and irresistable *Evidences* of Dr. *Hammond*. But, to be serious, the Doctor and I joyntly request the ingenuous Reader, to bestow more attentive and deliberate diligence, in examining and weighing well this part of the Controversie, then what hath gone before. The important weight of the truth in question, now hot in pursuit, and the very sound of *Evidence*, now mainly pretended, do both invite to a more particular attention. The Doctor especially granting, that the Question must be managed with *Evidences*, and so concluded, either on the one side, or the other. If the Doctors proofs conclude and manifest themselves to be indeed, what they are pretended, that is, *Evidences*, then I will grant the truth on his side, and the controversie an end. But if all the *Evidence* they bring, be onely, that they are most evidently repugnant and most injurious to Gods Word, to all Ancient Histories, and to themselves; that they are open Forgeries, and most absurd Deductions, shamefully abusing the Readers judgment, and ev'n his very eyes; then I hope, the Reader will pardon me, if I seem to bear less respect to him, in telling him plainly of his faults, who manifests himself to have quite cast off all respect to Truth, Gods Word, Antiquity, his Readers, and even to his own Conscience. But

C.4: S.4.

the

the Doctor begins to argue, have at Saint *Peter* then in this Chapter, have at the *Pope* in the next.

His first *Evidence* then (as he calls it) is from Scripture, *That St.* Peter *was the Apostle of the Circumcision, or Jews, exclusively to the Uncircumcision, or Gentiles.* Whence he infers, that St. *Peters* authority, being restrained to the Jews onely, could not be Universal to the whole Church. So that all his first *Evidence* is to evince the *No-authority* that Apostle had over the Gentiles, or the *Exclusiveness* of any Apostleship in respect of them. But first Mr. *Hammond* tells us, what he means by an *Apostle*, to wit, *A Commissioner of Christ, endued with authority by him; and this Commission given to him, as to all the other Apostles, indefinitely and unlimitedly; not restrained by Christs words to any particular Province, but equally extending to the whole World.* Where, since he would go about to define an Apostle, he might have done well to show in what he is distinguished from a Disciple. However, all he there says, is true; onely we adde, That neither by *any* subsequent act of theirs (as the Doctor imagines) was this illimited Commission given to each by Christ, restrained to particular sorts of men, or several large Dioceses or Provinces, so as to make them lose thereby their jurisdiction over other persons or places: However they might agree for the better propagating the Gospel, to disperse themselves into several Nations; or by the provident cooperation of Gods Spirit, have a more especial gift in converting some sorts of people, then others; and so applying more their industry, where they experienced more fruit of their Preaching, got

C. 4. S. 5.

thence

thence by their particular addiction to that sort of people, or that Nation, the appellation of *their* Apostle or Doctor. No *Exclusiveness* therefore of their ample Authority and Apostolical Jurisdiction from any Sect or Nation; no hedging or fencing in the unbounded vastness of their universally-extended Mission and Commission within the Verge of any particular Province or People.

Yet Mr. *Hammond* will needs have all their Authorities limited, for fear St. *Peters* should prove unlimited; and therefore layes for his *ground*, to conclude St. *Peter* Apostle of the Jews onely, *That they distributed their Universal great Province into several lesser ones.* This he evidences (for you must conceive, that all these Chapters are perfectly connected discourses, that is, manifest and noon-day *Evidences*) out of two places in the Sacred Scripture, in explicating which also his chief talent lies. These therefore we must endeavor to clear as far as our abilities will give us leave; For the Reader can imagine no less, but that these two places, being the foundation of the Doctors future discourse, must be most unconfutable *Evidences*; and consequently must needs cost as much toil and labor in the answering. C. 4. S. 5.

The first place he alledges to prove, That the Apostles had especial and peculiar Provinces *exclusively* to one another, is that of *Acts* 1. 25. where the Apostles pray God to shew, *Whether of the two* proposed (*Justus* and *Matthias*) *he had chosen, that he might receive the lot of that Ministry and Apostleship,* ἀ λαβεῖν τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς, *whence* Judas *strayed to go to his own place*; where he will needs have

τ κλῆρον τ διακονίας, &c. to signifie *a lesser Province.* Whereas first it is evident to common sence, that the lot of an Apostleship is nothing but the charge and office of an Apostle.

Secondly, It is most manifestly shewn to be nothing else, by the whole intent and transaction of the business; which was not, *to allot* one of them *a lesser Province*, but *to chuse a twelfth Apostle.*

Thirdly, The subsequent effect of the casting lots no less manifests it, delivered us in this tenor of words, *The lot fell on* Matthias; *and, he was numbred with the eleven Apostles*; not, *and thereupon he got the Government of a lesser Province.*

Fourthly, It is most plainly opposite to Scripture; for in the seventeenth verse of this very Chapter, St. *Peter* useth the self-same phrase τ κλῆρον, &c. (which the Doctor makes here stand for *lesser Provinces*) to express *Judas* his dignity whence he fell; and in which, (as the very place cited by the Doctor, manifests) the Apostles desired another should succeed, but no man ever dream'd that *Judas* had a lesser Province assigned him: It is therefore point-blank opposite to Scripture, to writh the words to this Interpretation.

Fifthly, This supposed, the Doctor is contradictory to himself, to imagine that, in which St. *Matthias* succeeded *Judas*, *a lesser Province*; since he acknowledged before, That this division of Provinces was made after our Saviours Ascension; and consequently *Judas*, who was dead ere his Resurrection, had no such Province in which another might succeed him.

Sixthly,

Sixthly, It is most notoriously contrary to all Antiquity; and consequently, either manifesting a most shameful ignorance, or wilful malice in so mistaking it: For whosoever gave but a glance into those studies, will plainly discern, That the Apostles distributing themselves into several Provinces, was done a long time after the coming of the Holy Ghost; whereas this installing of St. *Matthias* into his κλῆρος ἀποστολῆς, which he will have *lesser Provinces*, was manifestly before the coming of the Holy Ghost, as whoso reads the end of this Chapter, and the beginning of the next, will clearly discover.

Lastly, It is against your own translation, which expresses that, *The room of this Ministration and Apostleship, from which* Judas *hath gone astray*; which your special gift of interpreting Scripture makes signifie, *St.* Matthias *his lesser Province*. So that, all accounts made up concerning this place alledged, the result is, That this first *Evidence*, or rather the *Ground* of Dr. *Hammonds* future *Evidences*, is so strong and unmovable, that it alone resists the whole World; being evidently opposite to common sence, repugnant expresly to Scripture, injuriously contrary to all Antiquity, prevaricating from the translation of their own Church, and lastly, contradictory to the Doctor himself. But, *Humanum est errare*, No man but is subject to Error; he will make amends (doubtless) for this mistake in the next Testimony.

SECT.

Sect: 8.

The Examination of Doctor Hammonds *second Evidence, That the Apostles had distinct Provinces, so to prejudice St.* Peters *Universal Pastorship.*

His next Ground from Scripture (to put it out of doubt, that the Apostles had even then particular Provinces exclusively to one another) *That St.* Peter *calls the going to those lesser Provinces,* πορευθέναι εἰς ἴδιον τόπον ἴδιον, *to go to his proper place or assignation.* Good Reader, view but the place alledged and wonder. St. *Peter* speaks there of *Judas* his prevaricating from the Apostleship, and going to Hell (which is there cal'd *his proper place*) to receive his eternal damnation; and the Doctor calls it, *Going to his proper place, or assignation for the witnessing the Resurrection, and proclaiming the Faith or Doctrine of Christ to the World.* So as now the Doctor hath found *Judas* a Diocess amongst the Devils; and by his blasphemous interpretation would have St. *Matthias* succeed him. So blinde is *Schism*, when it is grown to an inveterateness, that a proof of *Quidlibet è quolibet*, is a sufficient Argument, nay an *Evidence* to legitimate disobedience; of which, these two Testimonies the Ground of this Chapter, are most pitiful proofs.

C. 4. S. 5.

Ibid.

And now can any man, that entitles himself a Preacher of Gods Word, have the face to appear in the Pulpit, to interpret those Sacred Oracles,

Oracles, after he hath been challenged and discovered to have so wilfully, and shamefully abus'd and corrupted them. And, alas, kinde Readers, and dear Countrymen, how tender a sence of your misery it must forcibly breed in any charitable heart, to think upon what slender reeds your present *Faith*, by which alone you hope for salvation, depends and relies. These are the men (for no priviledge is annext to your first Reformers and Teachers, more then to Mr. *Hammond*;) these, I say, are they, to believe whose interpretations of Scripture you have left, the sence and faith of the whole world; to follow whose false call, you have abandoned, and forsaken the cherishing and gathering wings of your rendereſt Mother, the Catholick Church, to stray up and down in a disordered wilderness of distractions. That Church, under whose care, your prudent and pious Ancestors for so many hundreds of years were brought up in a secure unanimity and settledness of beliefs That Church, in whose bosome they died, and from whose holy Arms they quietly delivered their happy Souls into the hands of their Redeemer, her ever-blessed Spouse. That Church whose Authority was under-propt with the strongest supports which can possibly be imagin'd to strengthen the frailty, and settle the ficklenesse of humane belief, in a most firm and constant adherence to supernatural truths; such as are the Motives of a never-interrupted Apostolical Succession, Universality, Sanctity, Unity in Faith, Uniformity in Practice, the ever-constantly-self-like Order in Hierarchical Government; the exactness in Discipline; the Possession of, and Skill

in the Sacred Writ; the Conversion of all Nations, and ours amongst the rest; the Splendor and Reverence she observes in her Ceremonies, and Administring the Sacraments; the long-enjoy'd continuance of the Belief of Infallibility; the learning and multitude of her Doctors and Fathers; the unmoved constancy of her Martyrs; the Angelical Purity, and *Seraphical* devotion of her religious Sons and Daughters; the higher and more elevated strain of piety in those *Cherubins* in flesh, her sublime and Heaven-soaring Contemplatives; the eminently-good and charitable acts (proper fruits of that Tree) many remainders whereof our thankless and ungrateful Countrey still enjoys: And lastly, all these, with many more, by a conspicuous visibleness to the eye, easie to be known, and most of them actually acknowledged by our very enemies.

This Church, I say, and all those pregnant Motives, greater then which, the world cannot afford, nor mans wit invent to oblige to a secure belief, you have slighted; and suffer your dear Souls to lie at stake, under the most dangerous accusation of a grievous *Schism*, without having any better game to play, or any other excuse to alleage in counterpoize of so many weighty Motives, then onely the bare fidelity and skilfulness of some few private men (such as is this Doctor) who pretend to be wiser in interpreting Scripture, then all the world besides; and who will not stick, when they want better shifts, to delude your eyes with obtruding their own forgeries and fillily-critical explications (as doth this Doctor) for most absolute EVIDENCES. Awake then,

as you tender your Souls endless good or misery, awake; and let these gross absurdities, with which they impose upon you, rouze you from the Lethargy of such an easie credulity. Wisely bethink your selves in time, how unsafe it is to relie on the bare Authority of their slippery interpretations, and relinquish the sence of the whole Catholick world: Which both possesses a thousand Motives they dare not lay claim to, and even in their own pretence, which is the right interpreting of Scripture, ought in all reason to have infinite advantages. Of this, dear Reader, I thought good to admonish thee by the way; in which, if I may seem to have said too much, the Doctor will make my words good in the process of this work; and if I have now complain'd for nothing, he will give me cause, ere he ends this Chapter, to complain for something.

But ere I proceed, I desire the Reader to heed attentively what is in question, and what is granted. It is granted, that Saint *Peter* preach'd to those of the Circumcision or Jews; and for the more particular fruit, which by Gods especial assistance he found, and the more pains he took amongst them, was called their Apostle: As also, that St. *Paul* preached to the Gentiles; and for the greater cooperation he experienced of Gods assistance in that work, which made him more particularly addict himself to them, he thence had the appellation of the Apostle of the Gentiles; as he himself clearly explicates himself in the place the Doctor alleages, *Gal.* 2. 7, 8. where he gives the reason why the Jews more particularly belonged to St. *Peter*, and the Gentiles to him in

these words, ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀπο-
λὴν τῆς περιτομῆς, ἐνήργησε καὶ ἐμοὶ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη.
*For, he that wrought with Peter for the Apo-
stleship of the Circumcision, wrought with me also
amongst the Gentiles.* Where the particle (*For*)
manifestly renders the reason why these two
Apostles were more properly particularized to
these two parts of the world; to wit, by
other designation, then the more especial
operation of Gods efficacious assistance, as
yet more plainly shown in the ninth Verse of
the same Chapter. This therefore is evident
and out of question, That St. *Peter* more par-
culiarly applied himself to the Jews, and St.
Paul to the *Gentiles*, at least in the beginning
of the Church. That which is in question, then
is, whether the Jews were so particularly
Peters Province, that his Authority was limit-
ed to them; so that he neither did, nor could
intermeddle in the conversion of the Gentiles;
that is, had no jurisdiction over them; and
the contrary of St. *Paul*. This is the Doctors
Position, from whence he takes his first Evi-
dence against St. *Peters* Universal Pastorship;
*That this Apostle was Apostles of the Circumcision
or Jews, Exclusively to the Uncircumcision or Gen-
tiles*. Which Assertion is so shamelessly false,
expressly-opposite to all Scripture, and ancient
History, that it was not possible for a man to
invent a Paradox so totally unwarrantable
and improbable as this. Nay more, I promise
the Reader, and Mr. *Hammond* too, That if
amongst those many Testimonies he produces to
prove it, there be but found any one sentence,
line, word, syllable, or letter, which excludes
St. *Peters* Authority from the Gentiles, more

C. 4. S. 5, 6, 7.

then

then what this man puts in his of own head, I will be content to yeeld him the whole Controversie. And may not a Doctor of Divinity be asham'd such a proffer should be made him in those very proofs of his, which he would bear the Reader in hand are most perfect *Evidences*.

And first his pretended place of Scripture; *Gal.* 2. 7. (which we have before explicated.) C. 4. S. 7. onely says, *That the Apostleship of the Jews of Circumcision was committed to St.* Peter; but that it was of *the Jews onely*, or none but them, as by the particular Commission to convert them, he lost or was *excluded* from any jurisdiction over the *Gentiles* (which is the Doctors assertion, and can onely advantage his cause,) there is neither in that place, nor any where else, the least syllable. Whereas it is impossible we should not see that the contrary (to wit, that St. *Peter* both had Authority, and did preach to the *Gentiles*) was as manifest in Scripture as the Sun at Noon-day; half the eleventh Chap. of the *Acts* being employed in a most exact Narration of St. *Peters* vision, exhorting Acts to preach to the *Gentiles*, which he accord- 10.34 ingly did, and went immediately by an especial Mission of God to convert *Cornelius* a Gentile, where he preached to him, and his whole house. As also St. *Peter* in the Council at *Jerusalem* affirmed saying, Ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέ- Acts ξατο διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν 15. 7. λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ πιστεῦσαι. *God hath chosen amongst us, that the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel by my mouth, and believe.* What can we think now of this Doctor, who puts, evidens out of Scripture, that St. *Peter* had

no authority to preach to the *Gentiles*, when as the Scripture expresly says, *He was chose out of the rest*, and particularly authorized for that end? Is this man fit to be accounted an expounder of Gods Word, who thus wilfully perverts, and purposely contradicts it?

Besides, if St. *Peter* were made Apostle of the Jews *Exclusively* to the Gentiles, by the same reason St. *Paul* was made Apostle of the Gentiles *Exclusively* to the Jews. For the words alleaged (*Gal.*2.7.) *The Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to me, as the Gospel of Circumcision was to* Peter, (upon which one C.4. S.7. the Doctor builds this *Tenet*) equally inferr *Exclusiveness* of jurisdiction in one, as in the other, over his fellow Apostles *Province*) as the Particle (*As*) signifies, and the Doctor himself confesses Section seven, unless the word (*as*) *liar*) must lose its signification. Yet it is most evident that St. *Paul*, where ever he came preached first to the Jews, as appears most evidently, *Acts* 13.5. & 14.1. & 17.1,2,3. where it is said, *That it was St.* Pauls *manner or custom to go into the Jews Synagogue, and preach Christ Faith.* Also *Acts* 20.18,21. where St. *Paul* speaks of himself, *That ever since he came into Asia, witnessed both to the Jews and Grecians, repentance towards God, and Faith towards Christ.* Likewise *Acts* 19.8. & 21.21. where the information against St. *Paul*, was, *That he taught all the Jews*, such and such things that followed there. So *Acts* 22. the whole Chapter almost being a Sermon of his to the *Jews*. Again *Acts* 24.24. & 28.23. where we finde, that, even at *Rome*, St. *Paul* preached to the *Jews*. And now let the Reader judge if this be not

most steel'd impudence, thus point-blank, and diametrically opposite to the whole stream of Scripture, and onely upon his bare word to impale and confine the Authority of the Apostles, to mutually-exclusive and contradistinct Jurisdictions; and all this, meerly out of malice (forsooth) against the *Pope*, to cut short his Authority, as he is Successor of St. *Peter*. These are the *Evidences*, dear Countrymen, your Doctors bring you to secure your Souls from the most dangerous sin of *Schism*.

Sect. 9.

Some Consequences out of the Doctors former Grounds, and his further Process in Evidencing.

YEt let us see, at least, what work the Doctor will make of it, if we let him alone to run blindly forwards upon his own grounds. He will have all the Apostles to have several Provinces limiting their jurisdictions, χλήρους ἀποστολῆς or ἰδίους τόπους (as the Doctor misfortunately called them) which must be peculiar to each, and exclusive of one anothers right, else this preparative ground will make nothing to the Doctor's purpose. Consequently to this foundation laid in the fifth Paragraph, he begins the sixth thus, *If the Circumcision or Jewish Christians were peculiarly St.* Peters *Province; and* (Section seven) *the Gentile Christians, peculiarly St.* Pauls, *&c.*

Now if this Doctor will stand to these grounds

thus laid, I would gladly ask, What becomes of the rest of the Apostles? Must they stand by, and look on while St. *Paul* converts *all the Gentiles*, and St. *Peter all the Jews*? You dare not say, That they were subordinate to St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*; that would endanger a kinde of primacy in jurisdiction: Will you say then, they onely helpt them? That sounds dangerously still, and intimates some *principality* in the others; allowing them no jurisdiction at all, but as far as the others please to accept of their aid. You must say, then that these Provinces of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* were promiscuously, and indifferently given to the rest. But the main Pillars of your *Evidences*, I mean your κλῆρος ἀποστολῆς, and your ἰδίας τόπους which you say all the Apostles had, and which apply'd to St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, you will have to signifie peculiar and exclusively-proper *Provinces*, will not bear, apply'd to the rest of the Apostles, the sence of a promiscuous authority. It onely remains then, that they have no κλῆρον ἀποστολῆς, that is no exclusive jurisdiction or peculiar Province at all, and therefore nothing at all to do. Thus this courteous Doctor hath by his acute way of reasoning, infinitely obliged the rest of the Apostles in freeing them from the hard and laborious task their Master enjoyn'd them, and *getting them all leave to play*. Nor hath he less obliged the Pope, if it proceeded from good-will in him, and not from malice and ignorance; for indistributing between St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* the Dioces of the whole world, he hath at unawares confirm'd the Pope, their Successor, to be the Universal Pastor of the whole Christian world; since it

is

is most certain, and by the Doctor acknowledged, That the Bishops of *Rome* (beginning with *Clement*) succeeded them both in that Chair and See. But is it not a pretty thing, that in his Section six, contrary to the grounds he had laid himself; and having no other reason, but his own conjecture, he cramps the vast Jurisdiction of that Bishop, Apostle, and our Saviours large Commission of *Euntes in universum mundum prædicare Evangelium omni creaturæ. Going into the whole world, Preach the Gospel to every creature*; given to each Apostle, into those few pitiful Parishes of the Jews of the dispersion. And yet afterwards, repenting he had granted him so much, he balks his former too liberal donation to St. *Peter*, of the *Lydian Asia*, and bestows it on St. *John*. C. 4. S. 11. Mark 16. 15. C. 4. S. 14.

But me thinks I hear the Doctors *Evidences* call aloud upon us to lend them a due consideration; which therefore, especially the world, being now adays so scant of demonstrations, it were an infinite wrong to the advancement of Sciences, carelessly to omit.

And first he *evidences*, That St. *Peter* had no *Primacy* at *Jerusalem* where St. *James* sate; or, as he terms it, *Singular Supremacy*. By which expression, if he would say, St. *Peter* was not particular Bishop of that place, it needs no evidencing: But if he intends such a *Primacy* as is pretended St. *Peter* had, what means the word *Singular*? or how does the Doctor *so quite take off all pretensions of St.* Peter *to such a Supremacy*, as he brags, *pag.* 73? *Because* (forsooth) *not* Peter *alone, but* James *and* John *entrusted that charge to him.* What a miserable Doctor is this? who makes account Saint *Peter* could not be C. 4. S. 6. Ibid.

cheifer

chiefer in Authority than the rest of the Apostles, unless he did all things alone by himself. And how can it invalidate *St. Peters* greater Authority that he took other two with him; since it is well known an Archbishop going to consecrate a Bishop, takes two other Bishops with him, and yet it follows not hence, that an Archbishop hath no higher degree of Authority than the Bishops. O, but he findes St.
Ibid. *James* named before St. *Peter*, *Gal.* 2. 9. and that (doubtless) he fancies to be an *invincible Evidence*; not considering that if that argument were allow'd any weight, his cause were lost; since in most, if not all other places in the Scripture, St. *Peter* is constantly named
Ibid. first of all the Apostles. Lastly, he tells us that St. *James* had the *Principal place in the Council of* Jerusalem, *where St.* Peter *is present*; *and ACCORDINGLY gives the sentence*, Acts 15 19. *upon which, the Rescript is grounded*. Where first, that St. *James* had *the principal place*, is a pitiful guessing Assertion of his own, without the least pretence of a Testimony; and yet he puts the word *Principal* in other letters, as a main business. Next, whereas he alleages that St. *James* gave the *Sentence*, and then quotes *Acts* 15. 19. I finde onely that St. *James*, after he had produced his Reasons, sayes, *Wherefore my sentence is*, *&c.* But the Doctor turns *my sentence* which can onely signifie his opinion or judgment in the matter, into *the sentence*, which sounds a conclusive definition and decision of a business under debate.

No wiser nor honester is his next Assertion, that the Rescript is grounded upon St. *James* his sentence in particular, citing for it, *Ver.* 22.

of

of the same Chapter; but there is nothing there particularizing St. *James*, but onely that, *Then* (to wit, after St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, *Barnabas*, and St. *James*, had spoken) *it seemed good to the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church, &c.* And upon what grounds can this demonstrative Doctor affirm, That the Rescript was grounded particularly upon St. *James* his sentence, and thence deduce his priority of dignity, when as it is manifest to any one that shall read the Chapter, that St. *Peters sentence* was the same with St. *James*, in the main matter controverted; both concurring, that the *Gentiles* should be freed from the grievous burthen of Circumcision: And although the abstaining from *Fornication*, *things strangled*, *and blood*, be found in St. *James* his sentence onely, yet how can this argue a greater Authority in *James*? did St. *Peter* vote the contrary, and St. *James* his sentence oversway? or would not the advice of commanding them to abstain from the things there prohibited, have been voted and accepted of by the Council, though the proposition had been made by one of inferior dignity? unless, perhaps the Doctor imagines the Apostles and Elders of the Church, assembled in the Council, were such weak, passionate and partial men, that they did not decree things because they were reason and fitting, but because St. *James* spoke them, whose greater Authority (the Doctor seating him in the *principal place*) they were, you must think, somewhat afraid of.

But any thing serves this Doctor for an *Evidence*. His all-swallowing faith makes that seem a demonstration against the Pope, which to us

poor

poor men, because of our unbelief, bears not so much as the least show of a probability. And, he imagines (from the particle *Then*) in the two and twentieth verse, which he misunderstands) that he who gives his sentence after another, hath an Authority above him. Though in reason one should rather think, after such debate as had been concerning this matter, Verse 7. it argued some greater Authority in him who should first break the Ice, and interpose his judgment in such a solemnly-pronounced Oration, as did St. *Peter*. But the Doctor will have the contrary a demonstration, and who can help it? The up-shot then of this Paragraph is, that the Doctors concluding against St. *Peters* Primacy from St. *James* his being *first named*, is a prejudice to his own cause; from his *principal place in the Council*, the Doctors own fiction; from his giving *the sentence*, and on it grounding the Rescript, two fine little diminutive frauds and abuses of Scripture; from his instalment, a frivolous piece of affected ignorance; and thus you have a perfect account cast up of the Doctors sixth Paragraph in his fourth Chapter of *Evidences*.

Ere I remove to another, I desire the Reader whose little curiosity has not invited him to look into languages, not to be amazed at the large Greek citations, which here swell the Margin: I can assure him they are nothing at all to the Question, but of indifferent matters acknowledged by our selves: And I will be bound, both at this time, and hereafter for the Doctors innocency in this point, That he is never tedious, nor over large, either in Citations

ons

ons or Reasons, which tend directly to the thing in controversie; as hath heretofore in part been declared, and shall more particularly be manifested hereafter.

In the seventh Paragraph, to omit what hath been answered already, he tells us, *That St. Paul had no Commission received from, nor dependence on St.* Peter, citing for it *Gal.* 1. 12, 17. Which words may import a double sence; either, that the manner of conferring upon him the power of an Apostle, was not by means or dependence on St. *Peter*; and so far indeed the Scripture is clear, and we acknowledge it; or else, that this power given him was not *dependent* on or subject to St. *Peter*, as the cheif of the Apostles; which is the question here treated; denied by us, nor contradicted at all by the place alleaged. But he proceeds in his fundamental absurdity, that those two great Apostles wherever they came, *the one constantly applied himself to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles.* Where if by, (*constantly*) he means *most commonly* or even *always*, yet so as they retained jurisdiction over the others Province, then (to omit, that it hath been shown contrary to Scripture) it makes nothing against us. But if it signifie *exclusively*, or so, That neither had any Authority over the others Province, (in which sence onely it can limit St. *Peters* Universal Authority, which as he expresses Section six, is his aim) then I refer the Reader to my eighth Section of this Chapter, where he shall see the contrary manifested to the eye by nine or ten most express places of Scripture; yet the Doctor goes on to evidence it by

Testimonies,

Testimonies, which obliges us to address our selves with new vigor to bear the shock of so terrible an encounter.

Ch. 4. *Sect.* 8. His first testimony is his own knowledge. *Thus we know* (saith he) *it was at* Antioch, *where St.* Peter *converted the Jews, and St.* Paul *the Gentiles*: But puts down no testimony at all to confirm the weaker ones of his own, *We know*; which yet had been requisite, that *we might have known it too.* But he tells us, that *certainly St.* Paul *was no ways subordinate to St.* Peter, *as appears by his behavior towards him avowed, Gal.* 2. 11. that is, *From his withstanding him to the face.* Yet wiser men then Mr. *Hammond*, to wit, St. *Cyprian* and St. *Austin* thought otherwise, who interpreted St. *Peters* bearing it so patiently, not as an argument of his less or equal Authority, but of his greater humility; that, being higher in dignity, he should suffer so mildly the reprehensions of an inferior, *Quem* (saith St. *Cyprian*) *quamvis* Primum *Dominus elegerit, & super eum ædificaverit Ecclesiam suam, tamen cum secum* Paulus *disceptavit, non vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se* Primatum *tenere, & obtemperari à novellis & posteris sibi potius oportere; nec despexit* Paulum *quod Ecclesiæ prius persecutor fuisset sed consilium veritatis admisit, &c. Whom, though our Lord chose to be the first of the Apostles, and upon him built his Church; yet when* Paul *contended with him, he did not challenge and assume to himself any thing in an insolent and proud manner, as to say, That he had the* Primacy, *and so should rather be obeyed by newer and later Apostles; neither did he despise* Paul, *because he had formerly*

Cyp. epist. 71. ad Quint. Aug. 2. de Bapt. contra Donatistas.

been

been a persecutor of the Church, but admitted the counsel of Truth. Thus that ancient, learned and holy Father St. *Cyprian*; yet Mr. *Hammond* hath *certainty* of the contrary.

SECT. 10.

The Examination of ten dumb Testimonies, which Dr. Hammond *brings to plead for him.*

THE next Testimony begins thus, *ACCORDINGLY* (that is, to the Doctors own *WE KNOW*) *in* Ignatius *his Epistle to the* Magnesians, *We read that the Church of* Antioch *was founded by St.* Peter *and St.* Paul. After which follows another of the same Author in his Epistle to the *Antiochians*, πέτρου καὶ παύλου μαθηταὶ γένεσθε, *You have been the Disciples of* Peter *and* Paul. What then? These Testimonies are stark dumb in what concerns the Doctors purpose; for the founding the *Antiochians* Church and teaching them, might have been done by the promiscuous endeavors of those Apostles. Here is not the least news of *distinction*, much less *exclusion* of Authority and Jurisdiction. True indeed, the Testimonies are defective, and to blame; but the Doctor knows how to mend them by his Interpretation. πέτρου καὶ παύλου μαθηταὶ γένεσθε, *You have been the Disciples of* Peter *and* Paul. *ID EST* (saith the Doctor) *converted and ruled by them; the Jewish part by one, and the Gentile by the other.* Was ever such C. 4. S. 8.

an

an *ID EST* heard off? to infer an exclusive distinction and limitation of Authority from terms plainly promiscuous, and from which a confusion of jurisdiction might more properly be deduced. So as not a letter of the question is found in the testimony, but what Mr. *Hammond* with a blinde *Id est*, addes of his own: Insomuch as it is left a drawn match, whether his *ID EST* or *WE KNOW* be the better Testimony: However, this is certain, that in the Doctors apprehension they are both of them most absolute *EVIDENCES*, because it is most *evident*, he says them both without either Authority or Reason.

Ibid. He labors in the next place to found a distinction of the *Jewish* and *Gentile* Church at *Antioch*; which, though it be not a jot to his purpose had he demonstrated it, yet it is pity to see what shifts he is put to in proving it. Necessity makes many a man forfeit his honesty, as this Doctor hath also done too plainly here. Where he abuses most grossly St. *Peter* with his Jewish Proselytes, and the sacred Scripture too, citing *Gal.* 2. 11. *That they withdrew from all communion and society with the Gentile Christians.* Whereas, in the Text, there is no such word as *ALL*, in which alone he can found the distinction of the Jewish and Gentile Church. Neither (as the place alleaged manifests) did they any otherwise withdraw from them, than in refusing onely to eat the Gentile diets; yet this he calls, *withdrawing from ALL COMMUNION*; as if the Doctor made account there were no other Communion, but in eating and drinking. Moreover, since to withdraw from *all Communion* with another Church, is against

fraternal

fraternal Charity, and according to his formerly-laid grounds, a *Schism*, (a sin inexcusable by such light trifles as were then between them) it follows most necessarily, that while he goes about to prove a perfect distinction of the two Churches at *Antioch*, he hath consequently made the *Jewish* Church, for withdrawing from *all Communion with the Gentiles*, Schismatical; and blessed St. *Peter* himself, a *Schismatick*, nay, a ring-leader of *Schismaticks*: But, God be praised, the place is proved to be falsified, and so good St. *Peter* is vindicated.

His fourth Testimony or *EVIDENCE* of the mutually-exclusive Jurisdictions of these two Apostles, is taken from the writer of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, who (as the Doctor saith *pag.* 75.) *ACCORDINGLY tells us that* Evodius *and* Ignatius *at the same time sate Bishops of* Antioch, *one succeeding St.* Peter, *the other St.* Paul, *one in the Jewish, the other in the Gentile Congregation.* Whereas the place alledged in the Author (which I will put down, because he slubberingly omits it) is onely this, (*Lib.* 7. *cap.* 46.) Antiochiæ Evodius *ordinatus est à me* Petro, Ignatius à Paulo: *At* Antioch Evodius *was ordained by me* Peter, Ignatius *by* Paul. This is all; there being neither before nor after, a syllable more concerning that matter. Where (besides that, the Doctor will, I am sure, acknowledge the Book of no sound Authority) you see the Testimony produced, expresseth onely their *Ordination* by the Apostles; but saith nothing of their *sitting together*, nor *succeeding the Apostles*; much less talks of the *distinction of the Jewish or Gentile Congregation*; least of all, of any mutual *Exclusiveness* of St. *C.* 4. S. 8.

Peter and St. *Pauls* Jurisdiction there; but all these, (which are indeed all that is to the purpose) are either voluntarily added by the Doctor, or groundlesly supposed, or else must be pretended as deducible thence by Mr. *Hammonds all-proving ID EST.* However the story goes (for it matters not much whether it be true or no) it is manifest first that the Doctor hath not brought a syllable of a proof to serve his turn, were it granted: Next, that the Testimonies by himself alleaged here out of *Eusebius* and *Origen*, calling *Ignatius* the second, and out of St. *Jerom*, calling him the third, make much against the sitting of two together: Neither will he finde St. *Paul* was ever accounted a Parcel-Bishop in *Antioch* with St. *Peter*, that he should have a properly-call'd Successor there: However he might perhaps ordain some Bishop to assist there after his departure. Lastly, ere he sees what he does, he blindly sweeps down all his own laborious Cobweb-work with a Testimony out of *Theodoret*, which affirms, that *Ignatius* received the Archisacerdotal honor ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης πέτρας δεξιᾶς *from the hand of that great Apostle St. Peter*, where the Doctor leaves out the word *Great*, lest St. *Peter* should have too much. Now then, *The Apostolical Constitutions* being a Book which is excepted against by all sides, and *Theodoret* being an Author beyond exception, we have far more reason to judg by these Testimonies, that *Great St. Peter* ordained *Ignatius* also, rather then *Euodius* onely; so as the Doctor is far from gaining, nay even comes off with no small loss from his own Testimonies, notwithstanding the faithful endeavor

deavors of his *ID EST* to the contrary.

His fifth Testimony is out of St. *Irenæus*, which affirms, that the *Apostles founded and built the Church at* Rome. The sixth, (which the Doctor praises for more expres) is of St. *Epiphanius*, who testifies, *That* Peter *and* Paul *were Apostles and Bishops in* Rome. The seventh from *Eusebius*, who tells us, *That the Inscriptions on the Apostles Tombs mentions them as Founders of that Church.* The eighth is from *Gaius*, an ancient writer, who calls their Monuments, *The Monuments of them that founded that Church.* The ninth is out of *Dionysius* of *Corinth*, who affirms both of the Church of *Rome* and *Corinth*, *That each of them was the foundation of* Peter *and* Paul. The tenth out of St. *Prosper*, who witnesseth, *That* Peter *and* Paul, *the Apostles, consecrated or constituted a Church in the City of* Rome. C. 4. S. 9.

These are six Testimonies of his, which I have put down in order as they lay, and fully as he cited them, not omitting a syllable. And now tell me, I beseech thee, good Reader, (for it may be thou hast better eyes then I) canst thou discern any the least word in any of these six Testimonies, which even seems afar off to limit St. *Peters* authority to the Jews, and St. *Pauls* to the Gentiles, which is the point in question? Is there any thing spoken here more than in a general and promiscuous sense, *That they builded, founded a Church, were Bishops, &c.* Do they found any distinction or *exclusiveness* of Jurisdiction? When thou hast well examin'd this; next, please to consider that to evidence by Testimonies, cannot be done otherwise than by expressing the thing to be *evidenced:* Which

thing in our present case, being the restriction, limitation, exception, and exclusion of St. *Peters* jurisdiction (which, as given to our Saviour, to him, and the other Apostles, was, without controversie, Universal) this cannot be expressed, nor consequently *evidenced* by Testimonies, otherwise then by restrictive, limitative, exceptive, and exclusive terms; such as are *Onely, solely, alone, to none else, &c.* This once understood and apply'd to the present occasion, and the Doctors manner of proceeding, whosoever thou art that readest this Answer, whether thou be'st Catholick, Protestant, Puritan, nay, even the Doctor himself, it is impossible but thou shouldst manifestly see that the Doctor hath not said one syllable to the purpose; there being neither in any of the former, nor following Testimonies, either out of Scriptures, Fathers, or Histories, any the least *restrictive* or *exclusive sentence*, particle or syllable for him: To say nothing, that all, both Scriptures, Fathers, and ancient Histories are most expresly against him. What a most unfortunate man is this Doctor to vent these for *EVIDENCES*; and how unfortunate they, who hazard the eternal loss of their Souls upon such mens writings.

But, to return to our six Testimonies: By what means, think you, does he make them speak to his purpose? Not by torturing and screwing the words, to confess what they never intended; that were impossible in such stubborn allegations, and perfectly-silent in what concerns him: Nor by intermingling words of his own to prompt them, and make them speak out, which is the old and often-discover'd trick

trick of his fellows; nor by criticizing, his former unsuccessful art; but by pinning a Paper of his own forging to the Testimony alleaged, and gulling the Reader to his face, that the Author sayes it. So as the device is the same, onely the method altered; for the said necessary Paper which he used to pin behinde the Testimony, now he pastes before it, beginning the ninth Paragraph, which introduces the formerly-recited Testimonies, thus; *The same is as* EVIDENT *at* Rome, *where these two great Apostles met again, and each of them erected and managed a Church, St.* Peter *of Jews, and St.* Paul *of Gentiles.* (Hold Doctor, the Testimonies should have told us that; why do you foreſtal them?) And then, as in the eight Section, after his own bare *WE KNOW*, he used the transition of *ACCORDINGLY* to bring in his Authors: So now after he had straw'd the way with his own *evident*, as he pleased himself, he ushers in the modest Testimonies with so many *Soes: So Irenæus, so Epiphanius, so the Inscription, so Gaius, &c*; whereas indeed the following Testimonies are no more *So*, or like his *Preface* to them, and to the question they are produced for, then (as the Proverb says) *the running of the Wheel-barrow* is to the *owing of six pence.* The Doctor shall put the Similitude in form, and the Reader shall judge: Just as I say (saith the Doctor) *That St.* Peter, *and St.* Paul, *each of them erected and managed a Church, one of Jews, the other of Gentiles, with exclusion of St.* Pauls *authority over St.* Peters, *and St.* Peters *over St.* Pauls *Congregation: Even SO St.* Irenæus *says, That they built the Church there; St.* Epiphanius, *That they were Apostles and* C. 4. S. 8. C. 4. S. 7. C. 4. S. 5.

Bishops there, &c. The Reader may perceive the fitness of the rest, by applying them at his leasure. Onely, ere I take my leave of these Testimonies, I would gladly learn of the Doctor, why, in his *preamble* to them, he maintains a distinction of Churches belonging to St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, and, then brings in St. *Prosper* with a *So*, to witness it; whereas himself in the nineteenth Section of this very Chapter makes the same St. *Prosper* testifie the quite contrary, and a promiscuous Jurisdiction over the Gentiles, saying expressly, *That* Peter *and* Paul *at* Rome, *Gentium Ecclesiam Sacrârunt*, *consecrated the Church of the Gentiles.*

Were ever such mistakes *incident* to any other man, as are *natural* to this Doctor? But it seems he wants a good memory, a necessary qualification for him that says any thing at random, without ground, authority, or reason, to maintain a false cause; or rather, indeed foreseeing the danger, he made the Testimony whisper softly in English, lest it might be taken notice of; translating *Ecclesia Gentium*, *The Church of the Nations*; because the word (*Gentiles*) would be too much reflected on, being that which throughout this whole Chapter he hath absolutely interdicted St. *Peter* to have any thing to do with. Alas poor man!

SECT.

Sect: II:

The Examination of Dr. Hammonds *Irrefragable Evidence, and other silent Testimonies produced by him.*

BUt now we are come to his *EVIDENCE of EVIDENCES*, the Seals of the Popes, which the Doctor here calls an *IRREFRAGABLE EVIDENCE*. I know, the Reader will expect some most expres and unavoidable Testimony out of some ancient Writer, beyond all exception, and of the first Class, witnessing, as the Faith of that Age, the contradistinction and contralimitation of St. *Peter* and St. *Pauls* Jurisdiction. The Testimony is out of *Matthew Paris*, which I will transcribe word by word, together with the Doctors Comment upon it. *In the Bull of the Pope stands the Image of St.* Paul *on the right hand of the Cross, which is graven in the midst of the Seal, and the Image of St.* Peter *on the left. And this onely account* (saith the Doctor) *given for St.* Pauls *having the nobler place,* Quia, &c. *because he believed in Christ, without seeing him.* (*Here on Earth*) addes the Doctor, in a Parenthesis. Here is all that belongs to this Testimony, transcribed to a word; without any more, either Explication or Application to the matter before or after, than is here put down. C. 4: S. 10:

And now, for Gods sake, Reader, tell me what canst thou discern here of St. *Peters* being Apostle of *the Jews onely, and exclusively to the Gentiles,* C. 4. S. 5:

Gentiles, which may deserve it should be called an *IRREFRAGABLE EVIDENCE:*

My eyes are dazel'd, it seems, with striving to see a thing at such an unproportionable distance; for I can espie nothing at all in it: Had the Question between us been, *Whether St.* Paul *believed on Christ without seeing him, or no*, it might have served to some purpose; but to our case it hath no imaginable relation. Yet this Eagle-ey'd Doctor, in the bare pictures of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* on a Seal, can discern clearly an *IRREFRAGABLE EVIDENCE*, that their Authorities are exclusively-limited, *St.* Peters *to the Jews*, *St.* Pauls *to the Gentiles*; which none living could see without his colour'd and insincere spectacles, to wit, blackest hatred and rancor against the Pope: While he looks through these, any thing appears an *IRREFRAGABLE EVIDENCE*, which may seem possible in his perverse imagination, to be detorted to the Popes prejudice, and to wound him, though through the sides of St. *Peter.*

C. 4. S. 10. After this Testimony or *IRREFRAGABLE EVIDENCE* follows immediately in the Doctor, *And all this very agreeable to Scripture, which onely sets down St.* Peter *to be the Apostle of Circumcision*, (*and of his being so at* Rome (saith he) *we make no question.*) What means his *All this?* For neither in any Testimony, nor yet in the *Popes Seal*, is there any the least expression of St. *Peters* being onely the Apostle of the Circumcision, save in his own words onely; yet he says, that *all this*, is in that point agreeable to Scripture; it is then of his own words he means, which how disconformable

formable, and totally repugnant they are to Scripture, hath already been shewn. Nor are they less dissonant in this very place to Sacred Writ; for neither doth *the Scripture onely* set down *Saint* Peter, *as Apostle of the Circumcision, but* James *and* John *also. Gal.* 2. 9. Nor is St. *Peter* any where exprest as *Apostle of onely the Circumcision*, but expresly particulariz'd the contrary, as hath been manifested out of *Acts* the fifteenth and seventh. So as that *ONELY* is your own forgery pin'd here to the Scripture, as before to your too sober Testimonies. Neither your Authors then, nor Scripture, speak a word of Saint *Peter* being at *Rome the Apostle of the Jews onely*; The onely proof of it is your own unquestionable certainty of it exprest here, that of his being at *Rome you make no question*; So that your onely grounds and proofs of your position is, *WE MAKE NO QUESTION*, and *WE KNOW*: And I here again confirm my former promise to you, That if you can shew me the least syllable, either in Scripture or your other Testimonies, expresly and without the help of your *ID ESTS*, and scruing deductions, restraining St. *Peters* Jurisdiction to the *Jews onely*, and *exclusively to the Gentiles*, I will yeeld you the Laurel, and quit the Controversie. C. 4. S. 10.

His twelfth Testimony (for his *IRREFRAGABLE EVIDENCE* from the *Popes Seal*, was the Eleventh) is brought in with another *So. So the Scripture affirms of* St. Paul, *that he preached at* Rome *in his own hired house, receiving them which came unto him*, Acts 28. 30. which the Ibid.

Doctor

Doctor *most fitly applies to the Gentiles of the City, the Jews having solemnly* (saith he) *departed from him*, Vers. 29. But looking into the Text I finde no such word as *solemnly*, which he, after his accustomed manner, pins to the Testimony nor any sign of a solemnity of departure, but rather the contrary, there being in that place no expressions, either of absolute relinquishing him, nor pertinacity, nor contempt; but only that after he had spoken, *They departed and had much discourse or debate amongst themselves*; which is rather a sign of hoveringness and unsetledness in the business, not indisposing them to a return, then of a fixed and *solemn* rejection of his society; and rather a solemn dispute whether they should return or no, than so solemn a departure as Master *Hammond* imagins. Next, the Doctor might have seen in *Acts* 13. 46. both *Paul* and *Barnabas* tell the Jews *boldly* (saith the Text) *That they would turn to the Gentiles*, and depart more solemnly, *shaking off the dust of their feet against them*, Vers. 51. Another manner of parting then this was, and yet many times afterwards did they preach to the Jews notwithstanding their so solemn departure. Lastly, What became of the Jews which (as is manifest in this eight and twentieth Chapter and twenty fourth verse) *were converted by St. Paul*? Must they necessarily quite fall out with St. *Paul*, and never see him more, because he had perswaded them to believe in *Christ*. Yet the Doctor upon authority onely of the word *solemnly*, which was of his own coyning, thinks he hath evidenced that St. *Paul* at *Rome* treated with none but *Gentiles*; the Text it self not admitting so much as a probability of it.

But

But all is good Corn that the Doctors Mill grinds.

His fourteenth Testimony is out of St. *Ignatius*; I will first cite the words as I finde them in the Author, in the place quoted by him, and then let you hear the Doctors Comment upon them. τί γὰρ διάκονοι (saith St. *Ignatius*) ἀλλ' ἢ μιμηταὶ τῶν ἀγγελικῶν δυνάμεων; λειτουργοῦντες αὐτῷ λειτουργίαν καθαρὰν καὶ ἄμωμον ὡς Στέφανος ὁ ἁγιος Ιακώβῳ τῷ μακαρίῳ, καὶ Τιμόθεος καὶ Λῖνος Παύλῳ, καὶ Ἀνάκλητος καὶ Κλήμης Πέτρῳ. *What are Deacons, but imitators of the Heavenly Powers, exhibiting to him* (the Bishop) *a pure and blameless Ministery; as holy* Stephen *did to blessed* James; Timothy *and* Linus *to* Paul; Anacletus *and* Clement *to* Peter. This is all. *Ignat. ep. ad Trall.*

And now, good Reader, (pardon me, that I am forced to trouble thee so often,) I intreat thee, as thou lovest truth and honesty, to take this Testimony and sift it well over and over, and then give in thy verdict, what thou canst discover in it, which, in the most far-fetcht construction, can be said to *evidence*, *That* St. Peter *was onely over the Jews, and* St. Paul *over the Gentiles*. Here to an ordinary eye, nothing seems to be said, but onely that St. *Peter* had such two Deacons, and St. *Paul* other two, which are there named; wherefore, I say, sift it well, and that with the disquisitive exactness as men do Riddles; and when thou hast spent all thy industry in vain, I will bring thee Doctor *Hammond*, who will cure both thine and my blindness by his Exposition; beginning his eleventh Section thus, *ACCORDINGLY* (observe the old transition) *in* Ignatius Ep. ad Trall. C. 4: S. 11.

Trall. *we read of* Linus *and* Clement, *that one was St.* Pauls, *the other St.* Peters *Deacon, both which, afterwards succeeded them in the Episcopal Chair*; Linus *being constituted Bishop of the Gentile*, Clement *of the Jewish Christians there.* And there he stops. Where all that any way makes to the purpose, is subjoyned by the Doctor out of his own head. There is no dealing with such a terrible adversary; who though he should chuse out his Testimonies blindfold, and at all-adventures, yet hath such a perilous faculty, that nothing can come wrong to him, but he will, ere he hath done with it, make it speak pat to his purpose.

What follows in this Section, is onely a vainglorious conceit, that he hath found out a way to enucleate a difficulty in History concerning *Linus* and *Cletus*, which all the Historians in the world never dream't on before; and this onely (forsooth) out of his own wrong-laid erroneous grounds. But because the Doctor says that this rare and unheard-of discovery, or as he calls it, his *Scholion*, is *UNQUESTIONABLY* true; as also because it is built onely upon the slippery sand of his own saying, already proved to be false, I will forbear to vex him, or trouble my self unnecessarily by vouchsafing it any farther confute.

C. 4. S. 12. His twelfth Section proceeding upon the grounds of his own *Scholion*, lately brought to light, to teach the world new History, never heard of before, tells us, *That in Pope* Clemens *the Union of the Jewish and Gentile Congregations was first made, and not in St.* Peter. So that the Doctor first, upon his own giddy imagination, fancied them distinct, and now (because he saw

saw no more but one Bishop succeed in the *Roman* Chair) fancies them united, without any word from History to countenance the former, or any thing but his own *Scholion* to make good the latter. And surely it were very strange that whereas the difficulty about the succession of *Clemens*, was so ventilated, and the opinions so various amongst the ancient Fathers, *Ignatius*, *Tertullian*, *Jerome*, *&c.* no man could ever understand the business aright, till this happy age in which Dr. *Hammond* was born; whose Glow-worm fancy evidenced more then all the former lights of the Church could discover. Many evasions they found out to solve the difficulty; As that *Anacletus* and *Cletus* were the same; that *Clemens* (who (as *Tertullian* says) sate the fourth, and yet was ordain'd by St. *Peter*) refused the Office till the successive death of *Linus* and *Cletus*: to which solution recur S. *Epiphanius*, *Ruffinus*, *&c.* but none ever dream'd of Dr. *Hammonds* facile all-solving *Scholion*, *That* Linus *was the first Bishop of the Gentile-Christians after S.* Paul; Clemens *the first of the Jewish after St.* Peter; which had been very obvious to those that lived so neer those times; but the reason why they did not, is evident, because they never dream'd of a distinction of *Jewish* and *Gentile Church* and *Bishops*, whereas the Doctor dreams of nothing else. The Fathers and ancient Writers were (alas) in a great mistake, imagining, that all the endeavors of the Apostles (as far as they could without scandalizing

* *Ignat. Epist. ad Mariam Cassobil. Tert. l. 3. carm. in Marc. Hieron. in Isa. 52. & l. de Script. Eccles. in Clem.*

Tert. de Præscript. c. 32. Epiph. Hær. 27. Ruffin. Præf. lib. Præcognit.

Scholion, *C.* 4. S. 11.

scandalizing either part) tended to reduce both the *Jews* and *Gentiles* to Unity and Uniformity in one Church, and to unite them in him whom they taught and preacht to be the Head-Cornerstone *Christ Jesus*, in whom is no distinction of *Jew* and *Gentiles*, till one Mr. *Hammond*, a Protestant Minister, came with his *Scholions* and *Id est*, to teach them contrary doctrine.

C. 4. S. 13. In the beginning of the thirteenth Section, he affirms stoutly, *That for another great part of the world it is manifest, that St.* Peter *had never to do, either mediately or immediately in the planting and governing of it.* If it be *so manifest* (Master *Hammond*) it had been easier for you to make it *manifest* to us; and was requisite you should, it being your proper task; otherwise to cry *it is manifest*, and yet bring nothing to prove it, is as much as to say, *It is manifest, because I fancy it so.* But as before you brought the invincible Testimonies of *WE KNOW* and *WE MAKE NO QUESTION*, for *EVIDENCES*, so now onely with an authentick *IT IS MANIFEST*, you think the deed done, and your cause evinced.

In his fourteenth Section, he tells us, *That St.* John *had the dignity of place before all others in Christs life time, even before St.* Peter *himself.* This he proves *plainly* (he says) *from his style of beloved Disciple, and leaning on Christs breast at Supper.* As if, because *Jacob* loved *Joseph* more then all his other Brethren, and therefore out of particular favor might have let him lean on his breast at Supper, it must needs mean plainly, that yong *Joseph* was the highest of his Brethren in dignity, had due to him the birth-right and in-

inheritance, &c. And who sees not, that the posture of leaning on *Christs* breast at Supper, was not an orderly and ordinary manner of sitting, but onely a peculiar grace and familiarity used towards him by his *Lord*; yet the Doctor is *certain* of it, and for more security gives us a gallant instance, *That leaning on Christs breast, signifies the first place next to Christ, as being in* Abrahams *bosom*, plainly signifies (saith this All-explaining Doctor) *being in dignity of place next to the Father of the Faithful*: From which instance of his, if true, it follows, that *Lazarus*, who was in *Abrahams* bosom, was above all the Patriarchs and Prophets except *Abraham*; as also, that none was in *Abrahams* bosom except *Lazarus* onely; since there can be no more *NEXTS* but one. But it is no wonder to see the Doctor trip now, who hath stumbled, nay fain down flat on all-four so often.

In the rest of this Paragraph, he tells us, That the Jews in the *Lydian Asia* were St. *Johns* peculiar Province; in the next, that the *Gentiles* there were St. *Pauls*; and when he hath done, destroyes both the one, and the other, with a Testimony out of St. *Chrysostom* concerning St. *Paul*, which says that ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας ὑπ' ἐμπιστευθέν; *A whole entire Nation, that of* Asia *was entrusted to him.* To which joyn what is manifest all over in the Acts that St. *Paul* preached to the Jews in *Asia*, it is palpable that this Testimony affirms St. *Paul* to have had Jurisdiction over all in *Asia*, both Jews and Gentiles. C. 4. S. 15.

Again, since the Doctors grounds make the Jurisdictions of the Apostles *exclusive* to one another, and this place tells us, that the whole entire C. 4. S. 5.

entire Nation of *Asia* was under St. *Paul*, it must follow out of his doctrine of *Exclusive Jurisdiction*, that poor St. *John* had not so much as the place of a Parish-Priest allow'd him of his own, but what he was beholding to St. *Paul* for. What an unpardonable blindness was this to prove St. *Paul* over the *Gentiles onely*, by a Testimony which entitles him *to the whole entire Nation?*

Sect. 12.

Another dumb show of Dr. Hammonds *Testimonies, to prove St.* Peter *over the Jews onely.*

C. 4. S. 16. After such invincible Testimonies alleaged, the Doctor begins to triumph, and tells us, *That we cannot say any thing in any degree probable for St.* Peters *Universal Pastorship over the Churches in the* Lydian Asia. And the reason he gives, is because *they were so early famous, as that Christ honored them with an Epistle in the Revelations.* It must be a wonderful acuteness in Logick, which can make this conclude; *Christ wrote an Epistle to those Churches,* therefore St. *Peter had nothing to do with them:* As if the same reason did not as well exclude all the rest of the Apostles as St. *Peter* from their Jurisdiction. But the Doctor says they were *early famous*; I ask him, were they earlier than our Saviours chusing twelve Apostles, and *Simon Peter* the first? if not, their earliness will not hurt us, nor help you.

His

His next two demands concerning St. *Johns* and St. *Pauls* Jurisdiction there, are already answer'd out of his own Testimony from St. *Chrysostom*. It follows, *Doth not St.* Paul *give him* (meaning *Timothy*) *full instructions, and such as no other Apostle could countermand or interpose in them, leaving no other Appeal, nor place of Application for farther directions, save Onely to himself, when he shall come to him.* And then to make the Reader believe, that all this is Scripture, he quotes for it immediately, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14, 15.

Doctor, Doctor, play fair above board. In the place you quote, there is not one word of all this long rabble, but the bare word *Come*, as is evident even in your own translation, where I finde it thus. *These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly. But if I tarry long, that thou maist know, how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the House of God, the pillar and ground of truth.* Where, in the fifteenth Verse there is nothing at all of this rambling story, which the Doctor talks of; in the fourteenth Verse, onely the word *Come*: So as out of this seemingly-barren Monosyllable *Come*, the Doctor hath miraculously caused a fruitful harvest of Testimonies arise for his purpose; to wit, *That St.* Paul *gave him such instructions, as* NO OTHER APOSTLE COULD COUNTERMAND OR INTERPOSE IN THEM, *that he left* NO APPEAL *or place of Application for further directions, save* ONELY TO HIMSELF, *&c.* Where are all those quarrelling and exceptive terms? But the Doctor seems willing not onely to limit the Apostles Jurisdictions, but also to set them together by the ears; as if they were jealous, that their fellow Apostles,

like usurping competitors, would intrude into their right, and therefore give express charge to debar their ambition *from putting their Sickle into another mans Harvest.* Good Mr. *Hammond*, let us have no more of these insincere dealings. Let the restrictive and exclusive words, which onely make for your purpose, be the witnesses, not yours; at least put them down with that distinction, as may easily be discerned; and do not, after a company of your own expressions mainly prejudicial to the Controversie, immediately cite a place of Sacred Writ, without producing the words, and so gull the Reader to to believe, That all which went before, is perfect and pure Scripture. Whereas, indeed scarce so much as a blank *Monosyllable* is found in the Testimony to countenance your alleaging it. But this is your solemn method all over your Book.

C. 4. *S.* 16. His next Argument is, that St. *Paul* gave Commission to *Timothy* without St. *Peter*. And who doubts, but that each Apostle might by his own single power, delegate and constitute whom he pleased, and where he pleased in any place of the world. I perceive by this whole Chapter, that the Doctor understands not the question, or at least could not have made a Book, without counterfeiting, not to understand it. We voluntarily yeeld him, that each Apostle had an Apostolical Commission over the whole world; and yet fear no prejudice should hence arise to St. *Peters Primacy*, amongst the rest of the Apostles. Had Master *Hammond* known this, it might have saved him all that pitiful puzzle in making good his first Evidence, That St. *Peter* was over the *Jews onely*, by

by patching those *old garments* of ancient Testimonies with the new peeces of his self-woven Additions.

This Concession of ours, and mistake of his; shews the next Paragraph, which harps upon the same string, to wit, *That St.* Paul *constituted* Titus *Primate in* Creet, to be nothing to the purpose: And I observe, That the Doctor (to give him his due) hath very good luck in this, That he proves those things pretty plainly, which none ever denied. *C.* 4. *S.* 17.

After this he tells us, That *Simeon Metaphrastes* affirms *St.* Peter *to have been in* Britanny *sometime, and baptized many into the Faith of Christ, and constituted Churches, ordaining Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons in the twelfth year of* Nero. How now, Doctor, what will become of your excluding St. *Peter* from any Authority over the *Gentiles*, if this Testimony be true; were not all the ancient *Britains*, at that time *Heathens* or *Gentiles?* Alas no; we and all antiquity were mistaken, the Doctor tells us, *That in all reason it must be extended no farther then St.* Peters *line, as he was Apostle of the Circumcision,* ID EST, (saith he) *to the Jews which might at that time be dispersed here.* So as though the story were true, yet the Doctor hath ever a help at maw; and rather then St. *Peter* shall touch a *Gentile*, he will fancy strongly, that there were I cannot tell, how many *Dioceses* of *Jews* in *England* (since there must be several *Dioceses*, where there are several *Bishops*) for St. *Peter* to convert and govern. So that *Britain* must swarm with Jews, *Which might have been* (saith this evidencing Doctor) *dispersed there*; and this without any authority, or likelihood, but onely *C.* 4. *S.* 18.

because Master *Hammond* and his *ID ESTS* say it.

C. 4. S. 19. In the last place, the Doctor concludes out of his former laid grounds, that is, out of his πορευθέναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, *Judas* his going to Hell, out of his own *ID ESTS*, *WE KNOW*, *IT IS MANIFEST*, *WE MAKE NO QUESTION*; out of his clasping together very unlike, and disaccording Testimonies to his own voluntary Assertions with the Hooks and Eyes of *SO*, and *ACCORDINGLY*; but most of all out of the Papers of his own Additions, pin'd before and behinde the too-bashful proofs. Out of these grounds, I say, without so much as one word in any Testimony, either out of Scripture, Fathers, or History, restraining the Commission of St. *Peter* to *the Jews onely*, he concludes, That that Apostle *could not be Universal Pastor of the Church*. This done, he hooks in with another *ACCORDINGLY* a Testimony of St. *Prospers*, which calls them *Hereticks*, *who depart from the Communion of Christ*, *and his Apostles* (in the plural) says the Doctor; and then reckons up promiscuously such and such Apostles, founding such and such Churches. What follows hence against St. *Peters* authority? This Testimony seems also something ænigmatical, and requires *Lynxe's* eyes, or the Doctors far-seeing and all-penetrating *Optick* to look through the thick rinde of it; which he willingly lends you in these words. *Where, as the Church had the several Apostles for their Founders* (*and those Independent one from the other*) *so the unity from which Hereticks and Schismaticks are said to depart, IS SAID to have been founded EQUALLY in each of them,*

them, in John, James, *and* Andrew *as well as in St.* Peter. The word *where*, and *is said*, would almost perswade the Reader, that all that follows is in the Testimony, but nothing is there, or any where else, *That the Apostles were independent of each other*; nor, that this unity was founded *equally in each of them*; nor in the rest *as well as St.* Peter: But all these his Doctorship huddles together of his own head. All the shadow of proof, one can have a glimpse of from this place, is, That the Apostles are here named promiscuously, and without distinction, and that therefore all were equal: Which, as it is onely a Negative and non-concluding Argument to say, That no distinction is here mentioned, therefore there was none; so, were the Conclusion admitted as Consequent, it makes as much against *Christ*, as against St. *Peter*: For he is also named joyntly with his Apostles, as those whose joynt-communion Hereticks leave. So as if the mentioning of several persons indifferently together without distinction of superiority, argue an equality in their Authorities, the Doctors Logick may with the same reason infer, *That Christ and his Apostles were independent of one another; that the unity from which Schismaticks depart is founded* EQUALLY *in them, in* John, James, Andrew, *AS WELL as Christ, &c.*

And this may serve for a sample of the Doctors solidness in reasoning.

Yet, it is some sign of wit, if one can do himself no good, at least to do himself no hurt; but the Doctor by this very Testimony, which made nothing at all for him, has most expresly

undone all his former work, even beyond the help of an *ID EST*; that is, beyond all hopes of remedy. For whereas he had bent all his endeavors to prove, that some Apostles had the *Jews* onely for their Province, and had more especially insisted for nine whole Paragraphs together, in limiting St. *Peters* authority to the *Jews*, no body knows where; as likewise St. *James* his to the *Jews* in *Judea*, Section six, and St. *Johns to the Jews of* Asia, Section fourteen.

This Testimony by himself here alleaged, expresly manifests a jurisdiction over the *Gentiles*, in all the before-limited Apostles; nay, even in all the rest. The words are these, as himself cites them. *In ipsâ Jerusalem* Jacobus, Joannes *apud Ephesum*, Andræas *& cæteri per totam Asiam*, Petrus *&* Paulus *Apostoli in urbe Româ* GENTIUM ECCLESIAM *pacatam unamque posteris tradentes, ex Dominica pactione sacrârunt.* James *in Jerusalem*, John *at Ephesus*, Andrew *and the rest of the Apostles throughout all Asia*, Peter *and* Paul *at Rome consecrated the Church of the* GENTILES, *&c.* Where, though the Doctor would blinde the Reader with Englishing *GENTIUM ECCLESIAM*, *The Church of the Nations*; yet it is most notorious, That that word in the plural, denotes particularly the Gentiles in opposition and contradistinction to the Jews; as is evident, *Matth.* 10.5. *In viam Gentium ne abieritis, &c. Go not into the way of the Gentiles, but rather to the lost sheep of the house of* Israel. The same is manifest, *Matth.* 1. 4, 15. *&* 6. 32. *&* 10. 18. *&* 12. 21. *Mark* 10. 33. *Luke* 2. 32. *Acts* 1. 4, 25. *&* 11. 1. and in almost innumerable other places, both

in

in the Old and New Testament. Thus the Doctor by this his strongest Testimony which he had laid up in store to conclude with *a plaudite* his foregoing proofs, hath quite invalidated all the rest; and so has brought his *EVIDENCES* at length to a fair market, which as before they were shewn to be but feeble props to support his partition-wall of *Schism*, which he is about repairing, and daubing, or playstering over; so now by an unluckily-lavish Testimony of St. *Prospers*, which told more then he would have had it, he hath made clean work, and quite razed down his former crazy tottering structure; and that from the very foundation, *ID EST*, and all.

Sect. 13.

Doctor Hammonds *second* General Evidence *against St.* Peters *Supremacy, from the Donation of the Keys, found to be obscurer then the former.*

THe second quarrel the Doctor hath against St. *Peter*, which he calls his *second Evidence* is, That no power of the Keys was given especially to St. *Peter*, and therefore no Supremacy. But before we come to scan the Doctors pretended *Evidences*, it were not amiss to advertise the Reader first, what an *Evidence* is; that this notion being set, as it were, in the confines and mid-way between the past and following proofs, he may at once, and with a readier C. 4. S. 20.

glance of his judgment, examine the strength and validity, both of those the Doctor hath already produced, and those he shall produce for the future. An *EVIDENCE* therefore, is that which is so clear and manifest a representation of a thing to the eye of Reason, as unless we should with a wilful blindness shut those discerning powers, it is impossible not to see it. This clear and undeniable manifestation in Arguments drawn from Reason, must be both of the verity of the promises in themselves, and also of the necessary and immediate sequel of the Conclusion out of the Premises, thus *evidenced*; and if *Evidence* in either of these be wanting, then that Argument cannot in true Reason be styled an *EVIDENCE*. But now a proof from Authority is then call'd an *Evidence*, when both the Testimony it self is authentick beyond dispute, and also the words alleaged so directly expressing the thing to be proved, that they need no Additions, nor Explications to bring them home to the matter, but are of themselves full, ample, and clear; nor possible without manifest wresting to bear any other interpretation; and, in a word, such as the alleager himself (were he to express his own thoughts in the present Controversie) would make choice of to use. This presupposed as a certain rule (as no man of Reason can or will deny it) both to judge the Doctors former *Evidences* by, and also these in question, we will now fall to examine them.

But first we charge the Doctor with prevaricating against his pretended promise: For whereas he begins as bearing us in hand he would bring *Evidence*, that St. *Peter* had not the

the Keys given to him in particular, he brings not one expres proof for the Negative, but goes about onely to solve our Testimonies for the Affirmative; which is not to produce *Evidences* of his own, but to endeavor an answer to our strong Allegations for it: And this is a quite different thing; for he who undertakes to *Evidence*, sustains the part of the Opponent; but he who strives to evade anothers objected Testimonies, manages the part of the Defendant; whose offices (as appears) are opposite and contradistinct. Neither indeed is this to bring *Evidence*, but rather Obscurity; for though he should obtain his purpose, he can onely shew by this means, that such or such Arguments do not conclude, but not that the thing it self is untrue; the evidence of which must depend on the strength of the grounds and goodness of the deductions, out of which and by which, the contrary is inferred.

Secondly, We charge him with a palpable injuriousness in making the answering our Testimonies out of Scripture, the sum of his first proofs, and yet omitting our chiefest, strongest, and most important place of all, *John* 21. 15, 16, 17.

Thirdly, We charge him with manifest calumniating, in saying, *We pretend this Donation of the Keys, as a peculiarity, and inclosure of St. Peter, and impugning it accordingly*; whereas he cannot be ignorant, that the Catholick Church holds no such thing, but that each Apostle enjoyed an Universal Commission of Jurisdiction, and Power to binde and loose; which yet debars not St. *Peter* from being the Head of them, and having an especial Authority or Primacy.

These

These things premised, to shew the Doctors false manner of proceeding, we buckle close to the Question.

C. 4. *S.* 20. The first place which the Doctor cites, as alleaged by us for the particular Donation of the Keyes to St. *Peter* in particular, is *Matth.* 16. 19. *I will give unto thee the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt binde on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven.* Which the Doctor acknowledges a promise to St. *Peter*; yet thinks to defeat it with other two places, *John* 20. 21. and *Matth.* 28. 19. where they are delivered in common, and in the plural to them all. Indeed, if we pretended out of the former Testimony *a peculiarity and inclosure of St.* Peter, so that he onely, and not the others, had power to binde and loose, then the Doctor had by the following places extending it to all, concluded strongly against us. But we never pretended any such thing; so that the Doctors own calumny is the onely ground of inferring his Conclusion, and solving the objected Testimony.

All therefore that we intend to deduce out of this place in St. *Matthew*, is, That (whether those words be *the Instrument of Christs* Donation, as the Doctor calls it, or no, yet) something was said to St. *Peter*, *in particular*, *and by name*, which was not said to any other Apostle *in particular*, and *by name*, as is most undeniably evident: For it was never said to *James*, *John*, *Philip*, *&c. in particular by name*, and in the singular, *I will give thee the Keys*, much less after such a solemn manner, as was to St. *Peter*.

First, With a particular blessing and encomium of him, *Blessed art thou* (in the singular) Simon Bar-jona, *for flesh and blood hath not revealed*

vealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. Then, alluding to his name in particular: *And I say unto thee* (again the singular) *that* Tu es Petrus, &c: *Thou art* Peter, *and*, super hanc Petram, *upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* Then follows, *And I will give unto thee* (still in the singular) *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.* Necessarily therefore it must be granted, That something was said to St. *Peter* in particular, and that solemnly and upon particular occasion sprung from St. *Peters* own person, *Vers.* 16. which was not said to any other Apostle in particular.

And, since this saying was a promise, it follows, That a promise of some thing was made to St. *Peter in particular*: Wherefore, seeing this thing promised was *the giving the Keys of Heaven*, it follows, that the promise of *giving the Keys of Heaven* was made to St. *Peter in particular*: Neither will the Doctors proving, that they were given afterwards *in common* to the rest, prejudice this at all; for there is no difficulty, but the same thing may be given to many *in common*, and yet to some one of those many in a more *particular* manner.

Now then, this promise being made not onely to all the Apostles in general, but also to St. *Peter* in particular; it is most consonant to reason, and worthy our Saviour, not onely to perform his promise, but also to perform it according to the tenor and manner in which he promised: But the Doctor cannot or will not finde any performance in particular, but wholly omits it (and indeed it was dangerous, for it was our best and most expres Testimony) and

instead

instead of it, produces onely a performance to them all in general, Whereas *John* 21. 15, 16, 17. he might have seen it expresly recommended and encharged upon St. *Peter particularly* and *by name* once, twice, thrice; with as many repetitions of his name particularizing him over and over *Feed my Lambs*; *Feed my sheep, feed my sheep.* And least such an one as Mr. *Hammond* should after so many expresly-peculiar designations, doubt yet there might be an *equality*, our B. Saviour asks St. *Peter*, *Amas me plus his*, *Dost thou love me more then these*; which manifestly puts a particularity, comparison, and inequality in Saint *Peter* from and above the rest of the Apostles in the interrogatory; and therefore the inference upon its resolution (*Feed my sheep*) encharged upon him as an argument of this greater love, and the cause of this truft, must in good consequence of reason be unequal, and particular in Saint *Peter*, in comparison of the other Apostles.

These and some others are the Testimonies from Scripture, which (to speak with the least) every impartial man will see, that even taken in themselves they sound much to our advantage, and the prejudice of our Adversaries; but interpreted by the Catholick Church, according to her never-erring rule of Faith, give us an infallible certainty, that they expres a *Primacy* in St. *Peter*, whatever the Doctors private judgment imagines or ghesses to the contrary. In a word, the result of all Dr. *Hammonds* Answer is, That our Saviour promised indeed *in particular*, but did not perform as he had promised, that is *particularly*, but *in*

common onely: That is, by such a solemn and singularly applied promise, he made good St. *Peter* expect great matters, (as any man in reason would, by such a carriage) and then, when it came to performance, quite deluded his expectation, giving him no more then the rest of his fellows.

It follows in the Doctor. *The applying the words particularly to Saint* Peter *hath one special energy in it, and concludes, That the Ecclesiastical power of Oeconomy or Stewardship in Christs house (of which the Keys are the token,* Isa. 22. 21.*) belongs to single persons, such as St.* Peter *was, and not to Consistories or Assemblies, That whatsoever St.* Peter *acted by virtue of Christs power thus promised, he should be fully able to act himself, without the conjunction of any other; and that what he thus did (*clave non errante*) no one or more men on Earth could rescind without him; which is a just ground of placing the power Ecclesiastical in the Prelate, not in the Presbytery, &c.* This is Master *Hammonds* Corollary out of the former Texts, out of which (ploughing with our Heifer) he concludes against the Presbyterians. C. 4. S. 21.

But first since those words are *particularly applied to St.* Peter, all that is implied in those words are particularly also appliable to him; and this being the *Donation of the Keyes*; it follows, That the Donation of the Keys, and whatever is consequent out of that Donation, or signified by those Keys, is particularly applied to him; but *the Keys are the token* (saith the Doctor) *of Ecclesiastical Oeconomy or Stewardship in Christs house.* This Office therefore must be particularly applied to St. *Peter*; and seeing those

those words were no otherwise particularly applied to St. *Peter*, then by our Saviours speaking them to him in the singular, and in a singular manner, (as he did) it follows, That our Saviour told St. *Peter* in the singular, and in a singular manner that he should be *steward* of his house. Also, since all particularizing is a kinde of exception from an universality or community, and the universality or community before whom our Saviour spoke it, and from whom any kinde of exception could be imagin'd to be there made, was the other Apostles, it follows, That St. *Peter* was particularized out of that community for the office of *Steward in Christs house.*

Again, since the *Keys are the token* (as the Doctor proves) *of the Ecclesiastical Oeconomy and Stewardship in Christs house*, and, however we read that the effect of the Keys, that is, *power of binding and loosing*, was given to others, yet it is no where expresst in Scripture, that *the Keys* themselves, the *badge* of that *Office*, were given to the rest even in common, (for its no where read *vobis dabo claves*) it follows manifestly, That if our Saviour kept his word to St. *Peter*, since he promised him the signal token of that *Office of Steward*, he performed it to him making him *Steward of his house*, and by the delivery of the Keys installing him in that *charge*; so as onely St. *Peter* was installed; and if the Doctor will needs contend the rest were, he must confess withal, that he hath no ground for it, since he will never read either of such a promise or performance made by our Saviour, that he would give the Keys themselves, which onely are the badge of that Function to any of the rest. Thirdly,

Thirdly, Since the giving *the Keys* is particularly applied to St. *Peter*, and that those Keys are *a token of an Oeconomy or Stewardship in Christs house*, it follows, the Apostles being a part of Christs house, or his Church, that Saint *Peter* was constituted *Ecclesiastical Steward* over them.

Fourthly, The Doctors inference from the particular Application of these words to St. *Peter*, *That the Stewardship belongs to single persons, and not to Consistories and Assemblies.* If he intend to deduce hence a power in all the rest of the Apostles, and all other Prelates, superior to their Assemblies or Consistories, is something screwed and far-fetch'd; whereas if the words be applied to infer, That one was made *Steward* or Superior in the *Consistory* or *Assembly* of the Apostles, they are plain and obvious, the present circumstances making that Explication natural.

Lastly, Saint *Peter* being thus constituted *Steward* in Christs house, all that follows in the Doctor (though otherwise meant) runs on very currantly, and upon his grounds; to wit, *That whatsoever St.* Peter *acted by virtue of Christs power thus premised, he should be fully able to act himself without the conjunction of any other, and that what he thus did* (clave non errante) *no one or more men on Earth could rescind without him.* Thus hath Doctor *Hammond*, while he disputes against his Brother Presbyters, fain into a sudden fit of Popery, and at unawares laid grounds for a greater Authority in the Pope, then many Papists will grant him. But it is onely a fit; he will recover, I doubt not speedily, as soon he begins to combate us afresh.

But

But now (as I said) the Scene is chang'd; The *Presbyterian* being roured by our weapons, *that the words were spoken particularly to St.* Peter, he throws them away; affirming here *pag.* 88. most shamelesly and expresly against Scripture, alleaged by himself, (which named St. *Peter* in particular, and no other in particular) *That this power was as distinctly promised to each single Apostle, as to St.* Peter, alleages for his first Evidence the words of Scripture, *Matth.* 18. 18. which he says are *most clear for that purpose.* But looking into the Text, I finde it onely spoken in common, and general to all the Apostles; not a word particularizing each *single Apostle*, and *distinctly* (as the Doctor would have it) which yet was done to Saint *Peter*, *Matth.* 16. 19.

His second most clear proof, is introduced with the old *ACCORDINGLY* thus; *And ACCORDINGLY*, Matth. 19. *the promise is again made of twelve Thrones for each to sit on to judge, ID EST,* (saith the Doctor) *to rule or preside in the Church.* Well done, Doctor; give you but your own proper weapon of *ID EST*, in weilding which you have a marvellous dexterity, and I'll lay an hundred crowns on your head against the best disputant in Christendom. All the world (as far as I ever heard) except this Doctor, understands the place as meant of our Saviours coming to judgment at the *Resurrection*, and the Apostles sitting with him to judge. But the Doctor with the help of an *ID EST*, hath made the day of Judgment come in the Apostles time, turned *judge* into *preside*; and θρόνος, a *Throne*, or *Judgment seat* into *Cathedra*, an *Episcopal Chair* or *See*.

His

His third proof is a dumb *Negative*, *That the Holy Ghost descended on all the Apostles in fire, without any peculiar mark allowed to St.* Peter. Which reduced into form, mutters out thus much, *That St.* Peter *had no peculiar mark of fire*, Ergo, (concludes the Doctor) *He was not head of the Apostles.* Where first I would ask the Doctor, how he knows there was *no peculiar mark allowed St.* Peter. He was not there, I suppose, to see, and there is no History, either sacred or prophane, that expresses the contrary. Next, if we may judge by exterior actions, and may believe, *That out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks*, then perhaps the Doctor may receive some satisfaction in this point also, that St. *Peter* had in a more peculiar manner the Holy Ghost: For it was he that first burst out into that Heavenly Sermon which converted three thousand. But nothing will serve the Doctors curiosity, except a greater tongue of fire; if he have not that, it is *most clear*, he is no *head of the Apostles.* What a wise man is he to think St. *Peter* could not be chief Pastor of the Church, but God must needs be bound to watch all occasions, to manifest it by a particular miracle.

His fourth is from these words, *And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.* In the name of Wonder, what can be deduced from this place against St. *Peters* Primacy? The Doctor will manifest it plainly; *And so* (saith he) *the promise of the spirit* EQUALLY *performed to all.* Suppose it were *equally*; what follows thence? Therefore St. *Peter* not *chief of the Apostles?* As if none could be higher in dignity, but he must necessarily have more of the *Holy Ghost* in

him. This Reason then, you see, is so shallow, that even a childe may foard it; but his consequence is still shallower, inferring from *their being full of the Holy Ghost*, that they had it *equally*. As if each could not be *full* according to their diverse capacities, and yet receive it in a very *unequal* degree. Our Saviour (*Luke* 4. 1.) is said *to be full of the Holy Ghost*, so is *Barnabas*, *Acts* 11. 24. yet, as I hope, the Doctor will not say, *Barnabas* had the *Holy Ghost equally* with our Saviour; So, all the Saints in Heaven are *full of Glory*, yet differ as *one Star from another* in the degrees of that *Glory*, distributed to them according to the measure of their several capacities. Which puts me in minde of a story of a Plough-man, who dining with his fellow-rusticks, when his companions strove to get the bigger Eggs, he indifferently chose the lesser; affirming, That all were equal: For which, when he was laught at, he defended himself with this (as he thought) serious Reason; That the little Eggs had as much meat in them, as they could hold, and the great ones had no more; and therefore there was no difference between them. Surely the Doctor heard this dispute, stole the Argument, and now infers here from all, being *full* of the *Holy Ghost*, that all had it *equally*.

C. 4. S. 21. The Testimonies you alleage out of the Fathers, *That the power of the Keys was conferred on all the Apostles; that from the giving St Peter the Keys, the continual successions of Bishops flows; that the Church is built upon the Bishops, &c.* We allow of to a tittle, and charge it upon you, as either a pitiful ignorance, or a malicious calumny, to pretend by objecting those, that we

build

build not the Church upon *Bishops in the plural*, nor allow any authority to them, but to the Pope onely; whereas you cannot but know how great Authority we give to Councils (consisting of Bishops) insomuch, as it is a School-dispute amongst our Writers, Whether the Pope or the Council be of higher Authority. Neither do the Testimonies of Bishops (*in the plural*) in the least manner touch us; there being not one word in them, excluding the Pope. Nay, rather they make for us; for the Church being founded on Apostles and Bishops, prejudices not St. *Peter* and his Successors to be the chiefest: And if so, then the Church is built most *chiefly*, and *especially* on St. *Peter* and his Successors, which is all we Catholicks say; and not on them *onely*; which he first calumniates us with, and then dreamingly impugns; ending his two and twentieth Paragraph with a Testimony out of St. *Basil*, *who calls Episcopacy, The Presidency of the Apostles; the very same* (adds the Doctor) *That Christ bestowed upon all, and not onely on one of them*; as if we held there were but one Apostle, or else that those Bishops who succeeded the rest of the *Apostles*, and were constituted by them, were not truly and properly *Bishops*.

It follows in the next Section. *By all which*, that is, by your omitting our best proof from Scripture, and answering the weakest; by supposing a calumny; by your mistake of *twelve Thrones*; by St. *Peters* having no greater a *tongue of fire*, and all the Apostles being *full of the Holy Ghost*; by the Testimonies of Fathers, naming Bishops and Apostles *in the plural*, out of which meer *plurality*, he infers an *equality* of

Authority. *By all this, the Doctor says it is evident again, That the Power which Christs Commission instated on St.* Peter, *was in like manner entrusted to every other single Apostle, as well as to him, &c.* Whereas he hath not produced one syllable, expressing any singularity used to any other *single Apostle*, as was to St. *Peter*; nor one equalizing term, of *as well, equally, &c.* but what he addes himself: Though these be the onely expressions can serve him, and which he pretends to here, as already produced; and by producing them to have made the matter *Evident.*

But the Doctor being by this time pump'd dry of his own *Evidences*, betakes himself to his former method of answering our Arguments, or (as he calls it) *to evacuate them.* And what Argument think you will he chuse to *evacuate*; but that which is drawn from the word πέτρος; and how will he *evacuate* it, but first from *Homers Iliads*, next from the *Revelations.* But indeed he puts our Argument so weakly, or rather not at all; that is, he swallows our proof so glibly, and yet *evacuates* it so groaningly, that it were charity in some good body to ease him in this his greatest extremity. The sum of his solution of I cannot tell what (for he urges no Argument of ours, but onely puts down the bare word πέτρος,) seems to be this, That πέτρος is the same with πέτρα, and therefore signifies vulgarly a Stone, and in *Homers Iliads* is applied to denote an huge loggerly Stone like a Mill-stone (μυλοειδὲι πέτρῳ:) Next, this Stone by the Scripture must needs be a foundation Stone; and there being *Twelve foundation-stones named in the Apocalypse,*

calypſe, called there λίθοι τίμιοι, *it muſt follow*, that πέτρος (which before was a vulgar-ſtone) is now advanced to be λίθος τίμιος, or *a precious ſtone*. Now follows his firſt inference (as well as I can gather it) *That all the twelve Apoſtles being in like manner* (*and not St.* Peter *onely and above the reſt*) *ſtyled Foundation-ſtones*; it is conſequent hence, that all were *equal*. Where firſt the Argument is again onely *Negative*, to wit, that no diſtinction is there put, therefore there was none: To make which inference good, he muſt firſt ſhew that, if there were any diſtinction, it muſt neceſſarily be expreſt upon all occaſions. Next, it is a moſt pitiful peece of reaſon to perſwade the Reader from onely a plurality, and naming twelve Apoſtles, that all were *equal*: As if out of the very naming in the plural twelve *Signs*, *Shires*, *Cities*, or *Magiſtrates*, it muſt neceſſarily follow out of the bare common name of *Sign*, *Magiſtrate*, *&c.* given to each of them, that all were *equal*. Again, the Doctor hath quite overthrown his cauſe by arguing, That not onely St. *Peter*, but the reſt alſo were called Foundation-ſtones; and therefore they were all equal: Since, granting (as he does) that a Foundation-ſtone, and πέτρος being the ſame, and onely St. *Peter* having the name of πέτρος, it follows in the Doctors grounds, That he *onely*, and, in good reaſon, that he more *particularly* ſhould be a Rock or *Foundation-ſtone*. Where note, that the Doctor would have all the Apoſtles call *Peter*; for the name of πέτρος being given St. *Peter*, by our Saviour, for no other end but to ſignifie he was a *Rock*, or (as the Doctor will have it) a *Foundation-ſtone*, and every Apoſtle being ac-

cording to Master *Hammond equally* such, it follows, That they have all as good title to be called *Peter*, as that Apostle, who alone (till Master *Hammond* writ,) had that appellation.

It follows (to strengthen his former weak reason) *And it being there in vision APPARENT, that the wall of the City*, Id est, *of the Church, being measured exactly, and found to be an hundred forty four*, Id est, (saith he) *Twelve times twelve cubits*, It is evident, *That that mensuration assigns an equal proportion, whether of Power or Province, to all and every of the Apostles; which is again a prejudice to the Universal Pastorship of any one of them.* Thus the Doctor, intends for an up-shot-Argument to *evidence* an equality in all the Apostles by the equal division of this Wall. But I crave leave to ask the Doctor, whether he be certain, that none of those precious Stones, which equally made up this Wall, is richer then the rest. For the richness in things of this nature, being more considerable, and more enhancing their value, then the bulk and quantity; it follows, That the greater preciousness and lustre which manifests it self in one above another, may better claim a signification, That that Apostle, who is represented by it, had an authority above the rest, then the equal measure of the Wall can infer an equality; nay more, if there be an equality in the bigness, and an inequality in the worth, there is no evasion, but it must resemble a worthier person. In order to which, there comes a congruous Argument to my minde; such, as if it were on the Doctors side, and he had the managing of it, I know he would make it a *MOST IRREFRAGABLE*,

and

and *UNQUESTIONABLE EVIDENCE*: And, though Catholicks, who understand the grounds of their Faith, slight such poor supports as a self-fancied Explication of the obscurest part of Scripture (in which chiefly consists the Doctors talent in *evidencing*) yet because perhaps he may fancy it stronger then twenty demonstrations, and so it may come to do him much good, he shall have it very willingly. Amongst these twelve pretious Foundation-stones, denoting the twelve Apostles, the Doctor will not deny the first to signifie St. *Peter*, to whom, he and his fellows, are content at least, to grant from our Saviours words a priority of *Order*. This first foundation then shadowing to us St. *Peter*, is here said to be a *Jasper*; the self-same Stone whose lustre shined in our Saviour, *Apoc.* 4. 3. and also in his Church, *Apoc.* 21. 11. Whence follows (would the Doctor triumphantly cry out) as an *IRREFRAGABLE EVIDENCE*, that St. *Peter* onely having the same lustre with our Saviour, is like him in representation, and so onely he resembles him as his Vicegerent or Vicar: As also, that being the same Stone the Church is made of, and *the first* of all the rest, it is *unquestionably true* (would he say) that he is the *first part of the Church*, that is, *her Head*. Under what luckless Constellation was Mr. *Hammond* born, to meddle with the *Foundation-stones* in the *Apocalypse*, and not fore-see this dangerous rub; which makes him so far from evidencing against us thence, that the very place objected, happens to be an *Evidence* against himself; I mean, such a kinde of proof, as he would call an *Evidence*. C. 8. S. 5.

And thus he concludes his fourth Chapter, containing the first substantial part of his Book. In which, as I sincerely profess I have not found one word to the purpose, that is, not one restrictive word of St. *Peters* Universal Pastorship, nor one express equalizing term of his power of the keys to the rest of the Apostles; so, I must confess withal, that I have both wearied my own patience, in laying open such a gallimaufry of shallow impertinences; and, I fear, my Reader also, who may think his time ill employ'd in perusing the confutation of so weak a Writer.

The

The Second Part,

Comprehending the Answers of the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Chapters.

Sect. I.

Of the pretended Primogeniture of Antioch, and the Doctors mistake of the Council of Chalcedon.

THis Champion of *Schism* having (as he thought) empal'd the Universal Jurisdiction of St. *Peter* to the dispersed *Jews* onely; proceeds, laying first his own mistakes for his grounds, in this fifth Chapter so depose the Pope, which he entitles thus, *The Evidences from the Bishop of* Romes *succeeding Saint* Peter, *examined*; as he did the fore-going Chapter, *The pretended Evidences of the Romanists, &c.* Where, first, he would perswade many good honest Readers, that he had urged our *Evidences* home, and afterwards salved them; whereas indeed he onely puts down a word or two of our bare *tenet*, and that not even as we *explicate* it, much less as we *evidence* it.

Secondly,

Secondly, He would seem to intimate again, that, it belongs to us to evidence; Let the Doctor know, the Churches *Evidence* is her long-and-quietly enjoy'd possession of the belief of Infallibility; in which, she was actually found when his upstart and disobedient Forefathers, the first Reformers, went out from her Communion. *POSSIDEO, QUIA POSSIDEO; OLIM POSSIDEO, PRIOR POSSIDEO*, is all the *Evidence*, and all the reason she is bound to give to her rebel-sons and out-lawed Subjects. So as it is your part to evidence, hers to hold and possess her own, till you sufficiently, that is, demonstrably, evidence her title to be unjust.

Thirdly, The Doctor is here also, as indeed generally every where, contrary to himself, inscribing the Chapters, as answers to our *Evidences*, yet spending almost the whole Chapters in producing pretended *Evidences* of his own; so performing the quite contrary to what he promised. But this is nothing with him.

C. 5. Sect. 1. His first Paragraph sayes onely, That St. *Peter* having no Primacy, the Bishop of *Rome* his Successor, could consequently have none. But because his Antecedent hath already been dash'd in peeces by my Answer to his former Chapter, no Consequence can be built upon it, till he have repaired his ground-work by a stronger Reply. Yet Mr. *Hammond* is so self-conceitedly confident of the invincibleness of his former Chapter, that he accounts this a work of Supererogation. Whereas, if to prove his first *Evidence*, he hath produced any one expres Testimony, That St. *Peters Jurisdiction* was limited to the *Jews* onely, which onely was the thing

in

in question; or if to prove his second EVI-DENCE, he hath produced any one express place to prove, That the *Keys* (though given to all) yet were not more particularly given to St. *Peter* (which onely is there the thing in question,) I will quit the field, and yeeld, though not my cause, yet my own particular conquer'd. But if he have not, what a vanity is it to brag, when he had said nothing at all to the Controversie, that he hath said all that is necessary, nay, even supererogated, and *said more then needs.*

In this second Paragraph, the Doctor would evidence, *That the Priviledges attending St. Peters succession, belong rather to the Bishop of Antioch, then of Rome.* And this he endeavors by asking three Questions, to which I shall answer in order.

First, he asks, *Whether St. Peter did not as truly plant a Church of Jewish believers at Antioch, and leave a Successor Bishop there, as at Rome he is supposed to have done.* C. 5. S. 2.

I answer, If you mean he planted a Church there of *Jewish* believers onely, so as he had no power over the *Gentiles* also, I absolutely deny it; and in your last Chapter, your proper place to prove it in, you had not one word to bless your self with, but what you added of your own. *That he left a Successor Bishop there.* If you mean such an improperly call'd Successor, as both himself and St. *Paul* left in many other places, that is, made some one a Bishop, and left him to overlook and govern that Church, I easily grant; but if you mean such a Successor as should succeed in the amplitude of Saint *Peters* authority, so as St. *Peter* should devest himself

himself of his *Primacy*, and give it him, not carrying it along with him to *Rome*, I deny he left there any such kinde of Successor, neither can there be the least shadow of Reason, why he should; nor is there any Testimony or Ground that he did.

Your second Quere is, *Whether this were not done by him, before ever he came to Rome?*

I answer, in the manner I have declared, doubtless he did.

Your third Quere is, *Whether these two Concessions do not devolve all power and jurisdiction on the Bishop of Antioch, St.* Peters *Successor there, which by that tenure and claim of Succession from St.* Peter, *can be pretended to by the Bishop of Rome?*

I answer, the first is not a Concession, unless first distinguished, as I shewed before; and the distinction given, intercepts the passage to his Conclusion.

To manifest which the better, we may distinguish in St. *Peter*, resident at *Antioch*, two diverse qualities of dignity: First, his particular care of that Church, as private *Bishop* in that See: Secondly, his publick office of Head of the Church, in which, consists his *Primacy*. Now when he left that City and went to *Rome*, he devested himself of the private care of that Church, and so it was necessary he should substitute another in the charge of that private Bishoprick; but did not devest himself of the dignity of chief of the Apostles; and so no pretence can be competent to his substitute in *Antioch*. This dignity annexed to his person by our *B. Saviour*, went along with him, whithersoever he went, and remained with him

living:

living; so that onely he who succeeded him dying (the Bishop of *Rome*) could claim the inheritance of that sacred Dignity, which nothing but his blessed Predecessors death could delegate unto him. At *Rome* he died, and was by dying devested; where he was devested, there was necessary a succession into the dignity, which he left, and was wanting by his death to the whole Church: This was his Primacy. This therefore must be the title of his truly called Successor there, and no pretence left for his substitute at *Antioch* made in his life time.

Most vain then is the Doctors conceit of the *primogeniture* in *Antioch*, unless he could prove St. *Peter* died there; in vain are his self-affirmed, and onely-self-proved positions in his third Section, to this purpose. In vain his assertion in the beginning of the fourth, *That if Rome derived any authority from the succession of St. Peter, Antioch* must for the same reason be preferred before *Alexandria*; since St. *Peter* onely constituted there a Successor to himself in the dignity which he then stript himself of, that is, of the private charge of that Church; which being onely an ordinary office, and no particularity resulting from St. *Peters* personal authority; it had consequently from the force of such a substitute instalment, nothing to elevate it beyond the pitch of an ordinary *Bishoprick*; and so it remained liable upon convenient Reasons afterwards ensuing, to be ranked after *Alexandria*.

This bolt then falling short of the mark, he is resolved at length to shoot home, and for his better advantages, stalks under the patronage C. 5. S. 4.

of

of the Council of *Chalcedon*; citing a Canon thereof, That the See of *Constantinople shall have* ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal priviledges, dignities, and advantages with Rome, upon this account, That Constantinople was new Rome, and the seat of the Empire at that time; which, say they, was the reason, that Rome enjoyed such priviledges; and therefore* τῷ αὐτῷ σκόπῳ κινούμενοι. *The Fathers at Constantinople being moved with the same Reasons, had rightly judged, That now the same priviledges should belong to that Church or City.* καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι δευτέρην μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν. *And that this being next to old Rome, should in all Ecclesiastical affairs have the same dignity or greatness that old Rome had.* Thus far the Doctor.

Where, first, I would ask him how he knows that ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, signifies the *Primacy*; are there no kinde of priviledges, but of equality in Jurisdiction.

Next, I would know why ὡς ἐκείνην, can exact no other interpretation but *AS SHE*, must needs be interpreted, *as much as she*, or *have the same dignity or greatness*; deducing an *equality* or *identity* from the particle ὡς, which onely denotes a *similitude* or *likeness*.

Thirdly, I must chide Mr. Doctor, (and with very good reason too) for Englishing ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς πράγμασι, in *ALL Ecclesiastick businesses*, whereas there is no such word as *All* in the Council; and in this word *All*, purposely added by the Doctor, consists the most efficacious part of the Testimony. For the word *ALL* may include possibly the authority of *Primacy* it self, which no other word there alleaged, can in any way signifie. But the Doctor

ctors Pen is still very free to let down Ink, when any thing of importance is to be added to a Testimony.

Fourthly, Πρεσβεῖα signifying nothing but certain honorary, pompous, or ceremonious priviledges, which might have accrued to some Church, by the residence of the supreme Secular power there. I see no necessity why the Popes Legates might not omit to oppose the reason there given, for the collation of these πρεσβεῖα; whereas had the word signified *Primacy*, which was then as strongly and expresly pretended to come from Christs donation to St. *Peter* (as is evident in Pope *Leo's* Epistles, whose Legates presided in this Council) as it is now by these present Popes, then we should have heard another story.

Fifthly, The Doctor grants, that this Decree was as derogatory to the dignity of *Antioch* as *Rome*; but it is evident, that *Antioch* pretended to no *Primacy* over the whole Church: Evident therefore it is from the Doctors own Concession, That ἴσα πρεσβεῖα could not signifie *Primacy* of Jurisdiction, neither consequently was that struck at by the tumultuous Constantinopolitans. C. 5. S. 5.

Sixtly, The very Council where this was handled, calls and acknowledges *Rome* the *first*; which the Doctor will interpret a precedency of order onely, and this he will grant the retain'd, notwithstanding these *equal priviledges* arrogated to *Constantinople*; if then ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal priviledges*, may be supposed to be given to another, *Romes* precedency and priority in order remaining untouched; why should we think, or indeed, how can we think that

that

that word meant the *Primacy*, or that this was concerned in the Decree, being much higher then the former; since this was sacred, the other complementary; this ever held as not possible to come otherwise then from *Christs* especial donation, whereas that might have probably proceeded from Ecclesiastical Constitution.

Seventhly, The Doctor (onely proceeding upon a whimsie born and bred in his own brain) tells us, *pag.* 99. that *ἰσα πρεσβεῖα* signifies a *Patriarchate*, and the pomps attending it, and that *Constantinople* wanted onely the dignity of a Patriarchate to be equal to *Rome*. Which is a most grosse mistake, and plainly demonstrating, That the Doctor took this Testimony, as he found it dropt from the Pen of some petty Writer, and never fetcht it from the Fountains of ancient History it self: For it is certain, and by all acknowledged, That *Constantinople* was a Patriarchate before, but the fourth; and now pretended to be the second, and so make *Alexandria* the third, and *Antioch* the fourth. Yet the Doctor runs on upon this ground, and ignorant of the truth of the history, winks and fights most cruelly; paying the Primacy of *Rome* with his own sayings, even to utter dissolution, till he comes to the end of the Paragraph.

Eighthly, It is manifest by the History and Acts of the Council it self, That this was no free Act, nor even came off clear: The ambition of the Clergy of *Constantinople*, extorting it with a tumultuous importunity; it being voted after most of the Fathers were departed, and onely those of the party of *Constantinople* left to determin

determine in their own behalf, what they or their instigators pleased; whereupon it was contradicted and exclaimed against vehemently the next day, by the Western Church, in the Popes Legates; disavowed and rejected by the Patriarch of *Antioch*, and those under him. No Patriarch of *Alexandria* was there; and all the Metropolitans and Bishops under him, refused to subscribe. The Act it self, not numbred amongst the Acts of the Council; till ambition, which, at first, receiving such a check from so grave Authority, was modest, growing more impudent, when the reprehending and curbing power was absent, legitimated that bastard-issue, and pin'd it to the end of the Council, as Dr. *Hammond* does his own sayings to the end of his Testimonies.

Yet the Doctor tells us, *He could vindicate the validity of this Canon, but that he means not to go out of his way.* Is it out of your way, Mr. Doctor, to vindicate that Testimony to be valid, which you object for a strong proof against us, and we reject as of insufficient Authority and illegitimate. In my poor judgment, it lies so directly in your way, that you cannot possibly do your cause better service, then to clear this point; else why did you produce a Testimony lying under a just Exception, unless you would stick to it, and maintain it. *It lay in your way*, it seems, to put that large-senc'd monosyllable *ALL* into the Testimony, that was just in your way, but to make good your own weak Allegation, was quite out of your way. Yet you were something excusable from under-propping your Testimony, if you had been better employ'd in the mean time; but I finde the whole C. 9. S. 5.

fifth Paragraph, in which you wave it, from the beginning to the end, made up onely of your own sayings, and some of those too false; upon which (as upon grounds) you proceed with an unresistable career. So as your proofs are perfect Cobwebs; both the ground and the work upon it, being spun out of your own bowels.

C. 5. S. 5. But instead of vindicating it, you first quarrel with us for *strange dealing in not admitting any Testimony against us, but wherein we have given our own suffrage*, which you call *A method of security, beyond all amulets, &c.* Thus the Doctor, plausibly indeed, if his Readers were fools, otherwise nothing can sound more unconsonantly. For either the Pope is head of the Church, or no: If he suppose negatively, then he plainly begs the Question which hangs yet in dispute; and then, upon this supposition, I will grant it is not onely *strange dealing*, but injustice, usurpation, tyranny, impiety, or whatever he will; or else the Pope was and is Head of the Church; and then, the Doctors words may be objected as well to any Governor, or any man living, as to the Pope; and it is not *strange dealing*, but very good reason, That he should refuse to subscribe to an Act, endamaging the Canons of the Church, it being his duty and obligation to keep them inviolate. And if Pope *Leo* could in reason reject it then, when one siding and self-interessed part of the Council had voted it; we can with as good reason reject it now, when Dr. *Hammond* alleages it.

SECT.

Sect. 2.

THe Doctors next *EVIDENCE*, that the Pope is not Head of the Church, is from a Canon in the Council of *Ephesus*; where (saith Mr. *Hammond*) *the independency of* Cyprus, *not onely from the Patriarch of* Antioch, *but from all others whomsoever was contested then, as from the Apostles times, &c.* Thus the Doctor desirous to make the Reader believe that *Cyprus* had no kinde of *Dependency on any one whomsoever:* Though the Testimony it self contests no more, but that *from the Apostles time they could never show, That the Bishop of* Antioch *was there,* Et ordinaverit vel communicaverit unquam Insulæ ordinationis gratiam, neque alius quisquam; *that is, And ordain'd or conferred the grace of Ordination upon that Iland, nor any other.* The Testimony speaks onely, That neither the *Patriarch*, nor any other *ordained there*, the Doctor interprets it, *That* Cyprus *was independent on the Patriarch of* Antioch, *or any one whomsoever.* Which is not ingenuously done; for there may be a dependency of subjection to the Jurisdiction of another, though they never received from that other their *Ordination. Thus you see, the Doctor seldom brings us an account of any Testimony, but less or more* he will be sure to *enflame the reckoning.*

But the Council exempted *Cyprus* from the peculiar subjection to a private *Patriarch* in particular: True, but is there any thing expresst there, That either *Cyprus* or the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* himself, were exempted from the Obedience or Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*,

as *Publick Head* of the Church, or was the Popes Primacy there called in question. This should have been expresst to make good your inference. But of this, we have not so much as a syllable, nor any thing that can deduce it; since the Ile of *Cyprus* might well have been exempted from the obedience of any particular Patriarch, and yet both it, and the Patriarchs themselves subjected to one *Chief* or *Head of the Church*: As there may be some free State or City in *Europe* independent of any particular Kingdom or Province, and yet both that State, and all the Kingdoms and Provinces in *Europe*, dependent or subject to the Universal Rule of an Emperor, who is Lord of the whole.

C. 3. S. 6. Yet the Doctor hath not done with us thus, he hath another fling at us out of this Council of *Ephesus*, which determined (saith the Doctor) *That no Bishop shall encroach upon anothers Province, or usurp a power, where from the Apostles times he had not enjoyed it. Which how directly* (adds the Doctor) *it prejudgeth the pretensions of Rome, is so manifest, that it cannot need farther demonstrating.* This therefore being Dr. *Hammonds*, PRIMUM PRINCIPIUM, *first Principle*, which is so evident by the light of nature, *and cannot need farther demonstrating*, it were not amiss, if we put it in a *Syllogism*; to let the Reader see how unavoidably the Doctor deduces a break-neck conclusion to the cause of *Rome* out of it. The Argument then stands thus.

The Canon of Ephesus *constitutes, That no Bishop shall encroach upon anothers Province, or usurp a power, where from the Apostles time he had not enjoyed it:*

But

But the Pope (must Dr. *Hammond* subsume) *hath encroacht upon anothers Province, and usurpt a power, where from the Apostles times he had not enjoyed it.*

Therefore, his pretensions are prejudiced by this Canon of *Ephesus*.

Where, as every childe may see, nothing follows out of the words of the Council against the Pope (which are the *Major*) until the Doctor makes good his *Minor*, *That the Pope hath thus encroached, &c.* Yet this (being all that belongs to him to prove) he either supposes as a *first principle*, though it be the onely thing in controversie, or else begs of us to grant him *gratis*; and then tells us the Conclusion *is so manifest, it cannot need farther demonstrating*.

Surely he was afraid here also *to go out of his way*; and with good reason, for had he gone about to evidence his *Minor*, he would never have arrived at his Conclusion.

After this most palpable and evident demonstration, he gives us two instances of the same alloy: One of the Archbishop of *Carthage*, whom the Emperor *Justinian* made equal in priviledges to the Bishop of *Justiniana Prima*; the other of this last-named Bishop himself, to whom the Constitution grants, *Omnem censuram Ecclesiasticam, summum Sacerdotium, summum fastigium, summam dignitatem: All Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, the supreme Priesthood, supreme Dignity.* These words sound high, and (as the Doctor thinks) terribly to us: But first he must consider, that *Justinians* Constitution is no Decree of a Council, nor his fact (in case he had pretended it) able to invalidate that sacred dignity of *Head of the Church*, had any such C. 5. S. 7.

been constituted by our Saviour. Next he never intended any such matter as to crop the aspiring growth of *Rome*, (as the Doctor imagines) which is manifest by his sending to Pope *Vigilius* (as strong a pretender of the Primacy as any of his Successors) to bestow a *Pall* upon his new Archbishop of *Justiniana prima*; nor would Pope *Vigilius* have consecrated him Bishop (as the Doctor shufflingly grants he did) upon these terms; neither was it *Justinians* pretence, who onely meant to exempt him from the Jurisdictions of them, whose Patriarchates heretofore extended to that Province.

But let us come to the Testimony it self; either the words, *All Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, supreme Priesthood, and supreme Honor*, must mean a supremacy over the whole Church, or in his own particular Diocess. If over the whole Church, *Justinian* constituted him Pope; which no man in his wits will say. If over his own Diocess onely, he might be *supreme* there, and yet subject to the Pope too, as is visible *de facto*, even now adays.

The next Testimony is from an old mouse-eaten Manuscript, concerning the Authority of the said Archbishop, forbidding Appeals to any other, in these words, *Tu & omnes* Justiniana *primæ Antistites, quicquid oriatur inter eos discrimen, ipsi hoc dirimant & finem eis imponant & nec ad alium quendam eatur, sed suum agnoscant Archiepiscopum omnes prædictæ Provinciæ.* What Authority this Manuscript is of (for the Latin shews, is to be of no Antiquity nor Humanity) I know not, having not seen the Book, it being hard to be found, and therefore a fit ground for an

an invisible doctrine. But this I know, it was pat for the Doctors Logick, which was to be besides the purpose. For here is nothing said, which was not common to the Patriarch, and such Metropolitans as *Cyprus* was, to wit, That they had no ordinary Appeal farther, as generally was none from any other Patriarch, unless peradventure *Jerusalem*, which was onely an honorary Patriarchate. Yet this no ways hinders, but that extraordinary cases, which could not be ended among themselves, should be carried to *Rome*, such as are controversies betwixt the Metropolitan himself, and the Bishops his subjects, or betwixt him and some stranger Bishop or Patriarch: So that all this Testimony is quite different from the case we handle, and leaves this Bishop as subject to the Pope, as any of the Patriarchs, or any out of the Patriarchate of the West was.

But our kinde Doctor is so free-hearted, he would not part without shaking hands, and doing us some good turn, and so was pleased to determine the question for us, in his next Citation, which is out of the 131 of *Novel*, of *Justinian*, *c.* 3. and the sense of it is, That he should be in all that Diocess, the Popes Legate, which now we call to be *Legatus Natus*; and in Catholick times, was a thing annexed to the Bishoprick of *Canterbury*: Wherein two things are clear, one, that his Diocess remained notwithstanding all these priviledges, subject to the Pope; and that to magnifie his dignity, this was necessary to make him the Popes Delegate, as it was also divers times used to the very Patriarchs; to whose dignity all these priviledges did not elevate *Justiniana prima*, though they

exempted it from them. *Justinians* words are, that in all that Diocess he shall have *Locum Apostolicæ sedis*; which the Doctor, (not to seem an open prevaricator against his own party) translates *the place or dignity of an Apostolical Seat*; whereas he should have said, *the place or lieu of the Apostolical Seat*; that is, should be the Popes substitute. And I pray (good Doctor) where did you read the Greek τόπος explicated for honor or dignity? And in what History do you finde such a dignity, as an Apostolical Seat in common? What dignity had *Ephesus* for St. *Johns* sitting in it, that the like should be given to *Justiniana?*

He goes on and tells us this was the occasion, why *Nicephorus* said the Emperor had made it a free City, and αὐτοκέφαλον, which to make more efficacious, he explicates *with full power, independent from all others.* We shall never out of the old Proverb, *The properer man, the worse luck*; He must needs be doing against himself, for this word convinces all the Doctors process of nullity: For since *Nicephorus* speaks not of the City onely as an Ecclesiastical State, but also as a Temporal one, and that by being made free and *self-headed*, he exempted it not from the Emperor by parity; these words do not exempt it in Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction from the Pope, whose power is as Universal as the Emperors, and extends it self much farther.

The Doctor was not so blinde, but he saw the Consecration of the first Metropolitan by the Pope, did stand in his way: Therefore to leap over this block, he tells us, it was necessary he should be consecrated by some body; and that it is evident, being consecrated, he was inde-

pendent

pendent, and his Successors to be ordained by his Council of Metropolitans. It is a hard case, that this good Doctor cannot speak three words, but one must unravel what the other knit. His excuse, why the Pope consecrated the first Bishop, was, Because some body must do it; and presently after, he tells us, Not the Pope, but the Suffragans were to consecrate his Successor. I pray then Master Doctor, why could not the Metropolitans have consecrated the first, as well as the others, if that signifie independency? But that is not our Argument, nor do we think Consecration implies dependency. But the Argument we make from *Vigilius* his consecrating him, is from two heads which the Doctor either saw not, or thought not fitting his Reader should see. The first is, That it draws a main consequence of the Popes consenting to this erection, and so absolutely evacuates the Doctors Argument. The other is, That he did not onely consecrate him, but give him a *Pall*, which act was a sign of Superiority, and a kinde of Benediction, and at least an Honor, if not a Jurisdiction. True it is, all this is nothing, if it be evident, that after Consecration he was absolute, as the Doctor affirms, and all are to believe, who will take his word for their faith.

In the next Paragraph, he tells us, That this particularity that his Successors were to be consecrated by their Council of Metropolitans, is a second instance of the point in hand; and I do not deny, but sometimes to be subject for Ordination, was sign of subjection, but not always. The Bishop of *Ostia* hath the priviledge to consecrate the Pope, yet the Pope is not held

held to be his subject: The Council of *Sardica* ordains, That the next Province shall give Bishops to a Province that wants, yet makes not that Province subject to it: The Patriarch of *Alexandria* gave the *Indians* Bishops, yet claimed no jurisdiction over them; and consecrated the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, yet was not *Constantinople* in his Territories. Therefore this is no rule of Subjection, and if it were, the Doctor must say this Primate was subject to his own Suffragans. Neither did ever Popes or Patriarchs in ancient times, demand the Ordination of all the Bishops in their Patriarchates; nor does the Pope at this day, demand it in other Patriarchates, though he claim jurisdiction over them.

But now, who can tell us what the Doctor means, when he says the Emperor did all this onely by making it a *Primates*, or chief Metropolitans See; and that *Carthages* being the prime *Metropolis* of *Africk*, is expressed by having the same priviledges with *Prima Justiniana*. Can any man think he intendeth other then to mock his Auditory? For as far as I understand, these words signifie, that the Emperor said onely, *Be thou a chief Metropolis*; and in so saying, gave all these Priviledges: Whereas all the Doctors labor hitherto, and the Texts by him cited, wherein every priviledge is set down so particularly, make it manifest, there were none or not eminent examples of any such Cities or Bishopricks; and therefore so many particularities were necessary to be expressed, and it be made an example to others: Yet upon this relieth the Doctors main evidence, and demonstration. Though, if you will believe him,

The

The conclusion of it self is most certain, and might otherwise be testified by innumerable Evidences; which we ought to suppose the Doctor omits for brevities sake, and contents himself with this riff-raff, and his Readers with bold promises and solemn affirmations.

In his tenth Section, immediately following, he draws out of his so strong discourse, a consequence able to make any sensible man understand the former discourses, were all vain and wicked: For says he, *If from the Apostles time there hath been an independent power vested in each Primate, or chief Metropolitan; then how can it be necessary to the being of a Member of the Catholick Church, to be subject to that one Primate.* Worthy Doctor, your inference is very strong and good. But I pray consider what is the consequent: Surely this, If there be no Catholick Church, the obedience to the Pope, is not necessary to be a member of it. A very learned conclusion, and worthy of so long a discourse to introduce it; yet see whether it be yours or no. You say, every chief Metropolitan was independent from all others, they made therefore so many absolute Churches; therefore made not any one Church. Where then is the Catholick Church, of which we ought to be members? Many houses to be one house, is as fairly contradictory, as many men, or horses to be one horse; and so of many Churches, to be one Church. *A Church* (saith St. *Cyprian*) *is a people united to their Bishop.* If then there be a Catholick Church, there must be a Catholick Bishop; and taking away the obedience to one Bishop, you cannot save one Church. I know you can talk like a Saint, That Christ is the Head

Head in which all *Churches* are united: But the *Church* is a Government upon Earth, and as an Army with its General, or a Commonwealth with its chief Magistrate in Heaven; were no Army, nor Commonwealth: So without subjection to a visible supreme Pastor, there will be no *Church* on Earth left us, whereof we ought to be Members; which is the true Protestant Tenet, whatsoever they may shuffle in words, an art wherein they are the most eminent of all Modern Hereticks. Therefore he had reason to enlarge himself no farther, but conclude with the Authority of his *Convocation*, *An.* 1537. To which, I confess my self unable to answer; for it is a pregnant and unavoidable Testimony: Onely I may remember our old English Proverb, *Ask my fellow, whether I am a Thief*; or ask *Caiphas*, whether *Pilates* sentence against our Saviour, was not just. You know it was a *Convocation* of Bishops, who for fear, renounced their Oaths taken in their Consecration; and therefore men of no credit, upon their pure words in this case. Now their Arguments are no other, then what are already discussed, that is, meer Cobwebs woven out of a tainted heart: Besides, those who supervived that wicked King, for the most part, with hearty penance, washed away that crime; and with their tears blotted out, as far as in them lay, the black Indentures of that dismal Contract.

SECT.

Sect. 3.

A Discovery of Dr. Hammonds *Fundamental Error, which runs through this Chapter, and his ingratitude for our Countreys Conversion.*

THe Doctor proceeding in his own mistaking method, which is, to produce faintly, and then impugn our Pleas, in stead of pleading for himself, who stands accused of Schism, entitles his sixth Chapter, *THEIR THIRD PLEA FROM THE BISHOP OF ROMES HAVING PLANTED CHRISTIANITY AMONG US:* As if we pretended the Conversion of this Nation, to have been the reason, why the Pope challenged here the *Supremacy*; or, That his being *Head of the Universal Church*, depended upon his private Apostleship, performed towards this Nation.

This is the ground of all his ensuing Chapter, which being absolutely false, and forged upon us, it had been sufficient to have past it over with this civil reproof, *Doctor you mistake.*

For what Catholick Author ever affirmed, the Pope is beholden to his Ancestors care, in bringing *England* to *Christs* Faith, for his supreme jurisdiction there; or that his title of Primacy had not been equal in this Countrey, in case it had hapned *Constantinople* or *Alexandria* had sent to convert it? We will therefore free the Doctor from any obligation of Subjection to

the

the Popes Primacy, which he causlesly fears may come by this title; so he will acquit himself, and the Church of *England*, of another which lies heavy on them, and makes up the full measure of their Schism, unless they retract it. For if greatest benefits, draw on greatest engagements; and no benefit be so great, as that which rescues us from the Devils tyranny, the the bonds of Infidelity; and brings us, by enlarging our hearts by Faith, into the glorious liberty of the Sons of God: Sure no Obligation can be conceived so indispensably-binding, as that which is due to those who were Authors to us, of so inestimable a good. This consideration should make the enjoyers of that benefit, while they were sons to such a Mother, more humble and obedient, in an especial manner, and by consequence in an high measure, aggravate the horrid sin of Schism, in not onely rebelliously, but most ingratefully abandoning the communion of so tenderly beneficial a Parent. This should make them after the breach made (though they cannot yet so overcome their proper-will, and proper-judgment, as to return) at least, candidly to acknowledge the benefits received from her, and to bear her a due respect; however, not to revile and reproach her. But against all History, and onely out of a few obscure and unauthentick sayings, to disacknowledge your highest obligation to her; in stead of grateful courtesie, to slight, and contemn her; to naturalize in the hearts of your poor Auditors, an hatred against the very name of *Rome*, and the *Pope* (to which, *Rome* and its *Pope*, you and they, are beholding, next, and immediately under God, for

all the knowledge you have of *Christ*, or his holy Word:) Lastly, To revile that Church, which (till you broke from her) had ever the most sacred title of *Christs* onely Spouse, with your scolding Sermon-invectives (grateful elegancies to your applauding hearers) of *Idolatrous*, *Antichristian*, *Strumpet*, *Whore of Babylon*, and all the venemous spiteful expressions, that ever were vomited from a malice-impostum'd heart: These things, I say, are they which brand you beyond infamy in the judgment of prudent men, and double Dy the dark-coloured sin of *Schism*, with the deepest tincture of the blackest ingratitude. Of this ingratitude, Master Doctor, clear your selves, first in breaking, next in your carriage and comportment ever since, and we will without much difficulty, disoblige you from any other duty, which you seem afraid you ow us, upon onely that score of *Conversion*.

Yet you will needs have us hold, whether we will or no, That the Pope is *Head of the Church*, because his Predecessor converted *England*: And this ground laid in the air of your own fancy, you impugn as inconsequently, butting at us most formidably with a *Dilemma*, or cornuted Syllogism; and telling us, *That the Popes Primacy in this Iland, is either from the Donation of Christ, or Conversion by* Austin *the Monk: If the latter, then* England *was not subject to the Pope before* Austin's *coming: If the former, then is that other title of the Conversion by* Austin, *a fallacious pretence*, A NON CAUSA PRO CAUSA, &c. This is the sum of his *Dilemma*. C. 6. S. 2, 3.

In answer to which, I confess indeed, the latter

latter title is, *A fallacious pretence, A NON CAUSA PRO CAUSA*; but the fallacy is on the Doctors side, who feigns us to pretend what we never thought on; to wit, That the Popes supremacy is grounded on any such title. One of the horns then of his *Dilemma*, is a false one, and so the danger of being catcht between them, easily avoided.

Nor is his *Dilemma* it self, more solidly founded, were both the particular pretences *true*; for it wholly insists and leans upon this Position, That no man can claim a possession upon two titles: On which ground (to let us see he is a *Lawyer*, as well as a *Divine*) he descants in
C. 6. S. 2. these words, *He that claims a reward, as of his own labor and travail, must be supposed to disclaim Donation, which is antecedent to, and exclusive of the former; as the title of descent is of that of conquest.* Thus this Doctor of Law. Whereas, what more ordinary then to plead two titles at Law, (as for example, birth-right, and a formerly-given judgment) for the same thing? Or, what more unreasonable then to affirm, That *Jacob* who wrought other seven years for *Rachel*, could not claim her as a reward of his service for that time, unless he renounce his right to her due at the former years end. Do not we see daily, That those who have palpable right to their estate, when they cannot quietly enjoy it otherwise, by reason of the injustice of a wrangling adversary, are forced to compound for, and buy their own, without disclaiming their former title?

Neither is his last instance more solid, then its fellows, That the title of *descent* is *exclusive* to that of *conquest*; since the titles of *Donation*

and

and *Conquest*, are as opposite as those he mentions, and yet it is well known, That *William* the Conqueror pretended a *right* to the Kingdom upon both these *titles*; and *Henry* the Seventh (if I mistake not) upon three. But the thing is so clear, that it requires no further proof; save onely to advertise the Reader, That Dr. *Hammond* is the first Lawyer I ever heard of, who denied a possibility of a double title to the same thing: Yet I am glad to see by the Doctors perfect ignorance, and utter unacquaintance in Law, that he is, at least, a good, honest, quiet, sober soul; not used much to trouble himself with Law, nor wrangle with his Neighbors; which is a very great commendation, and better beseeming his innocent Nature, which was never shaped to be a Controvertist.

Next, proceeding still on his own false grounds, he goes about, first, ingratefully to deny, that St. *Austin* the Monk converted our Forefathers: Secondly, After some acknowledgment, to prove very unmannerly and uncivilly, no thanks due.

As for the first, he tells us, *That this Iland was converted to the Faith of Christ, long before* Augustines *Preaching to the Saxons*; citing many Authors for it. Where if by the word *Iland*, he mean the *Ilanders*, as I suppose he must; I would then ask him, (though the former Ilanders were before converted by the Missionaries of Pope *Eutherius*, yet) whether those that St. *Augustin* was sent to convert, that is, the *Saxons* were reduced before that time to Christianity, or no; if they were not (as I am sure he must, and will acknowledge) all the ancient C. 8. S. 43

Inhabitants, the *Britains*, being driven by them into *Wales*; then what a perverseness and want of ingenuity is it in Master *Hammond*, to wave so ungratefully, that incomparable benefit which we Englishmen received in our Ancestors, by the Popes fatherly care, first converted to *Christs* Faith? and what a pitiful shift it is, to shew a willingness to put it off by quibbling in the words, *this Iland*; as if they did not signifie *these Ilanders*, or *the Ilanders of the same race*; but these *Trees*, *Woods*, and *Mountains*.

The next page goes on very currantly, and without any rub, proving, That the formerly-planted Faith of *Christ*, in this Iland, was not totally extinguished by the ancient persecutions; so to infer a less beholdingness of us Englishmen to *Rome*, and Pope *Gregory* the Great for our Conversion; but all in vain: For unless he proves, that they who had formerly embraced and retained that Faith, propagated it to the after-comers, the *Saxons*, (who were Ancestors to us Englishmen) or that St. *Austin* was not the first that preached to these, (which he will never do) all the evidence he can bring from hence is, to prove himself ungrateful.

Then he ends this Paragraph with a Testimony out of the old obscure Annals of *Giffburn*, and brought to light by one of his own side, in which it is said, *That the Bishop of St. Davids was consecrated by the Suffragan Bishops of that Province*, *Nulla penitus professione vel subjectione facta alteri Ecclesiæ*. *No profession or subjection at all being made to another Church*. Where first, I would ask the Doctor in which of these words he places most force; in, *Their Consecra-*

tion

tion by their own Suffragans, and by no other? What difficulty in this? As if the Pope could not be Head of the Church, but he must needs consecrate all the *Bishops* in the World; yet more then once the Doctor hath bob'd us with this: Or is it in these words, *Nulli penitus, &c. No profession, &c?* As little follows hence; for the custom of making a profession, or *exhibiting subjection to the See of Rome*, when the Bishops were consecrated (expresst in those words, *facere subjectionem*) was not then in use; and though it were not now, it would not at all prejudice the amplitude of the Popes Jurisdiction, as *Head of the Church*. Besides, the words being *Alteri Ecclesiæ, To another Church*; not specifying *Rome* in particular, it affords nothing express for the Doctors purpose; but may well bear the interpretation of the Bishop of St. *Davids* being independent of any within that Continent, or (as before was said of *Cyprus*) of any private Patriarch: With which, as is evident, may well consist a subjection to the Pope, as the Churches chief and Universal Pastor.

To what follows in the fifth Section of the Abbot of *Bangors* answer, who flatly denied subjection to the Pope of *Rome*: First, we reply, It matters not much what the old Abbot said; for every one who hath read those Histories, knows the ill-will of the *Britains* was so extreme against the *Saxons*, at St. *Austins* coming; the apprehension of their tyrannous usurping their Country, and driving them out of their own being, then flagrant and fresh in their memories, That they refused to joyn with St. *Austin* for the salvation of their Souls. And

they might probably be afraid, lest admitting and coming under Saint *Augustins* Jurisdiction, they might open a gap for the further encroachment of their late cruel persecutors. Neither was it hard to imagin, seeing the *Britains* ever since *Aetius* came to assist them, by reason of the turmoils of the Empire, and several incursions of barbarous Nations, had little or no commerce with *Rome*: A remote Abbot, whose office is to look to his own private Monastery, should be ignorant of what was due to the chief Pastor of the Church, especially other as great errors being crept in among that Nation. But what's all this to us? unless the Doctor can prove that, whereas the whole Christian world held the then Pope, *Gregory* the Great, Head of the Church, as appears by his Epistles to all Churches. This Abbot did well in denying that Authority which all else granted, and submitted to; or that this Abbot communicated with them, who admitted and acknowledged it. For we do not undertake to defend, that there could not be at any time two, three, or more persons, who either out of disgust, ambition, interest, or ignorance, might speak or act against the Popes Authority, but that it was the profession of the then Catholick Church.

The words therefore of this Abbot can make nothing against us, unless the Doctor will undertake to vindicate him from ignorance and interest, and that out of settled and unprejudiced Reason; he in so saying, pronounced the sence of the whole Catholick Church.

Yet I have not done with this story of the Abbot thus; I alleage moreover, that it is either

either absolutely fabulous, or else, both all ancient Histories, and (which is more) Doctor *Hammond* himself is mistaken; and therefore however it may possibly be true, yet can claim no credit if it be once taken in a lie. It makes the Abbot in the close of his blunt Speech, affirm, *Nos sumus, &c. We are under the rule of the Bishop of* Caerlegion *upon* Usk, *who is to overlook and govern us under God.* Whereas it is manifest there was no such Bishoprick at that time; it being translated in King *Arthurs* days, which was fifty years before this, from *Caerusk* to St. *Davids*, as the Doctor himself grants in the foregoing Paragraph. C. 6. S. 5.

But for a more full and perfect answer to this upstart instance of that ancient Nation (if what I have said, suffice not) I desire the Readers perusal of the ingenuous and solid *Appendix* to that excellent *Manual of Controversies*, lately composed by the Learned *H. T.* where I believe he will finde this new piece of Antiquity irrecoverably confuted.

What follows in the sixth Paragraph, is onely a conclusion out of what he hath said, That the whole Iland is not Schismatical, because St. *Augustine* converted not the whole. Where first he onely proves the Welshmen no Schismaticks, but still leaves himself and his Fellow-Englishmen (whom he ought to have cleared first) in the suds. Nay, though the *Britains* were not then Schismaticks upon that account, not being converted by St. *Augustine*, yet now being subjected to the *English Bishops*, and incorporated into their Church, if this Church be proved Schismatical: The Welshmen, who are Sons, Subjects, depending on,

and a part of her must needs incur the same censure. Besides, his premises being all invalidated, and his grounds wrongly laid, his conclusion must needs be weak and ruinous: For we do not accuse him of the substance of *Schism*, for refusing obedience to the Pope, as his Successor, who sent to convert *England*; but as Successor to him, who had the *Primacy* by the Donation of *Christs* own mouth: However, the former may render the rupture more enormous, seeing that part of *Christs* Seamless-coat was close knit to the whole, by such a near and firm obligation.

Sect. 4.

His continuance of the same Fundamental Error, and some mistaking Proofs, That Kings can erect Patriarchates.

C.6. S.7. BY this time the Doctor, *through Gods assistance, and his Readers Christian patience*, is come to the second part of his Text; which is, that even this part of the Iland, which was converted by St. *Austin*, cannot entitle the Pope to Supremacy over them. Where, to omit that his whole grounds are erroneous (as I have before manifested) in supposing *that* to be our Plea for the Popes *Primacy*, let us see, at least, how consequently he handles it. To prove his po-

Ibid. sition, he tells us, *The Nations converted by St. Paul, were not to be ever subject to that Chair, where St. Paul sate?* Good Mr. Doctor inform

us

us what you intend by the Chair, where Saint *Paul* sate: *Whether in the Church of* Antioch, *or* Rome, *or the like*, say you.

But first, it is meerly a fiction that St. *Paul* ever sate in any Chair, or was fixt Bishop in any place, but at *Rome* onely with St. *Peter*; and to demand whether all Countreys converted by him, ought to be subject to his Successor there (that is, to the Pope, who succeeded both him, and St. *Peter*) is onely (in another phrase to ask over again the Question of the whole Book, and is the same, as if he should ask whether the Pope be *Head of the Church*.

Next, you tell us, *That* Timothy *and* Titus *were supreme in their Provinces, and independent from any other See.* This indeed the Doctor says, and we must believe him, though he brings not a word of proof for it; which the second part of his Assertion, concerning their independency, did necessarily require; onely, he says, *the contrary hath no degree of truth in it*, which he makes account will carry the business, without bringing the least *degree* of probability for it. As for the first part, I would ask the Doctor, whether St. *Paul* were supreme over them in his life time, or no; if he were, (as I suppose both his Epistles to them, and the Doctors former large Testimony from the monosyllable *COME*, will manifest) then *their being supreme in their own Provinces*, consisting still with the superiority of St. *Paul*, may (for any thing deducible from that reason alone) admit the *Supremacy* of the Head of the Church, and their subjection to him: And the obligation lies yet upon the Doctor to prove positively, That *Timothy* and *Titus* were totally exempt from

St. *Peters* Jurisdiction; for which, Negative proofs are insufficient, or indeed for any thing else. Yet the Doctors Quiver is full of such blunt shafts; and it is an *evidence* with him to argue thus, *I have not read it*, or *it is not expresst in this Testimony*; therefore there is no such thing, or, therefore it is false: As hath been often discovered in the process of this Answer.

That which follows, *That it is the nature of Primates or Patriarchs, to have no Superior to exercise Jurisdiction over them*, is onely his own saying; and so with like facility denied, as affirmed. The Ordination of them, by others, I have already shewn, not to prejudice the Universal Authority of the Head of the Church; whose duty it is not to descend to otherwise suppliable actions, about particular Members of that Body; but from the top of his *Primacy*, to govern and overlook the whole, and to be conversant about that more Universal sort of actions reserved, and proper to his larger power; to the managing of which, the shorthanded Jurisdictions of particular Patriarchs, were not able to reach.

C. 7. S. 9. But now comes the most dangerous blow of all: The Doctor did but take his aym all this while; now he is fetching the fatal stroke, and me thinks I see the Ax even now falling upon the neck of *Rome*. He threatens in his ninth Section, *To put the whole matter out of controversie*. And how, think you? he tells us, *That Kings could ever erect and translate Patriarchates in their own Dominions; and therefore that the Kings of* England *may freely remove that power from* Rome *to* Canterbury, *and subject*

all

all this Iland to that independent Archbishop or Primate. There is a trick now for the Pope, which he never dream'd of: Where first you see Mr. *Hammond* supposes, as granted, That the Popes power is but meerly Patriarchal, which is the chief, if not onely thing in question between us: So as his *method to put the whole matter out of Controversie, is to beg the supposal of the whole matter in Controversie.*

This supposal laid for a ground, he repeats again for his first instance, those two late answered Acts of *Justinian*, erecting *Justiniana Prima and Carthage, two Arch-Bishopricks or Primacies*: Though himself acknowledges, That *Carthage* was *not originally dignified*, but *onely restored to its Primacy* by the said Emperor, after the *Wandals* were driven out; which being onely an Act of preserving the former Canons of the Church inviolate, every good Christian Emperor, and Prince, not onely may, but also ought to do it; and when he does it, it is by the power of the Canons of the Church. C. 6. S. 10. C. 6. S. 11.

As for the first instance concerning *Justiniana Prima*, the Dr. thinks perhaps, good man, that he doth well; but put the proof in form, and he will, I am confident, be ashamed of the consequence. *Justinian erected Patriarchates* (saith the History) *therefore Kings have power to do such acts of themselves*, (infers the Doctor) where the force of the illation is the same, as if one should say, *The late Parliament took away Bishops; therefore Parliaments have a power to take them away*: That a particular matter of fact may conclude a self-and-proper power in him that

did

did it, you must first prove that power to be originally his own, and not delegated to him by another, pretending to it himself, who in our case is the *Pope*: Next you must prove, That if he did it without that delegation, yet his action was lawful.

These, if you first prove, your instances will come to something; otherwise, they are senceless, and infer less then nothing; wanting both the crutches which may enable them to advance forwards to a conclusion.

C. 6. S. 12. Your next instance is, That the Emperor *Valentinian* did by his Rescript constitute *Ravenna* a Patriarchal Seat, where you quote no Author but *Anno Dom.* 432. And indeed you did well, for the Rescript is accounted spurious, and to have been foisted into the Monuments of that Church in the time of their *Schism*. Had you told us, how invalid the Authority of it was, and how not onely for that, but for many other things it lay under just exceptions, you had been put to the puzzling task of defending its authentickness.

The exceptions against it, are these: First, It begins in a different manner from the constant tenor of all other Rescripts: Next, the decree is singular, and consequently to be suspected in this; that all the other Rescripts made in the reign of the two Emperors, though constituted by one of them onely, yet were ever authorized by both their names, whereas the name and Authority of the Emperor *Theodosius* is wanting to this. Thirdly, the Inscription of *Imperator Major* is new and unheard of; all the rest, entitling *Valentinian*, *Imperator Maximus*. Fourthly, the Bishops of *Rhegium*,

sinum, *Placentia*, and *Brixillis*, are in the Rescript named, as under the Archbishop of *Ravenna*, which is a plain forgery; since, not long after Pope *Leo* commanding *Eusebius*, Archbishop of *Millain*, to gather a Provincial Council of the Bishops subject to him; those three Bishops met there, and subscribed to that Council, as appears by the *Synodal* Epistle yet extant. Fifthly, The same Rescript which gives them *Archiepiscopatum*, *an Arch-Bishoprick*, (which you make a *Patriarchate*) granted them also *the use of the Pall*; which was never accustomed to be given by the Emperors, but by the Popes onely; as appears by the Epistles of *Gregory* the Great, to the then Archbishops of *Ravenna*. This last rub so puzzled *Hieronymus Rubeus* to smooth it (who out of a preposterous love of his Countrey, cited this Rescript for its priviledge) that he was forced to explicate that *Pall* to be *Cæsarum Paludamentum*, such an Imperial Robe, as the *Cæsars* used to wear; whereas, besides the unlikelinesse of the action, it is plainly contrary to the Rescript it self, which grants them such a Pall, *Sicut Cæteri sub nostrâ Christianissimâ potestate sæpe degentes fruuntur Metropolitæ*; *As the rest of the Metropolitans in his Dominions often wore*: Which every one who hath but tasted of the study of ancient History, knows to have been another manner of thing, then the Emperors Robe.

We cannot then in reason think other, but that either the Rescript is false, and (because no new Bishop of *Ravenna* could use the *Pall*, without a new Concession from the *Pope*, as appears in St. *Greg. Lib.* 5. *Epist.* 8.) forged in the time of the *Schism*, that they might have some

some pretence to retain still the use of the *Pall*, which they accounted honorable. Or, at least, it cannot be imagined to have been made without the Popes consent; since the Pope in the very next year after the making of this presumed Rescript, appointed and constituted (even those of *Ravenna* at first, being unwilling) Sr. *Peter Chrysologus* to succeed in that See, after the decease of *John*; as the same Monuments affirm: Whence, the Doctor, but from a manifestly corrupted part of them, pickt out this Testimony.

That the after-Bishops of *Ravenna* were sometimes Schismaticks, all the world knows; none excusing them, much less bringing that action of theirs for a Testimony, or example, till such as Mr. *Hammond* arose, who were involved in the same crime: But that *from* Valentinians *time*, Ravenna *held the Patriarchate till the time of* Constantinus Pogonatus, *without dependence on the Bishop of* Rome (as the Doctor tells us) is an intolerable mistake, as any one meanly versed in History, knows; and as is manifest by Pope *Gregories* Letters to the Bishops of that place; who was made Pope in the year Five hundred and ninety, whereas *Pogonatus* began his reign in the year Six hundred sixty and eight. Their fact then, Master Doctor, can onely stead or excuse you thus far, to shew, that others have been Schismaticks as well as your selves; and therefore you are not the first, nor onely men that have fain into a such a lapse: And thus far indeed, we grant your consequence; but it will not serve, to shew that you are faultless, because they were faulty. You should have manifested first, the

the justifiableness of their fact, and then proceed by applying it, to justifie your own. Or rather indeed it infers you are Schismaticks, because you cling to none but those, whom all the world esteemed to be such.

But me thinks, I hear the Doctor gravely complain, That I call all those *Schismaticks*, whom he alleages as Testimonies against me; and that this also is, *A method of Security beyond all AMULETS.* I answer, let it neither be as he, nor I say, but what the whole Christian World, both then and ever since held; none contradicting, but those who were acculed of the same fault. Let us therefore make plain Reason our Judge in this present Controversie.

The Popes, at the breach of the *Ravennates* from their subjection, made head against them, and stood upon their Authority, as Universal Pastors of the Church, (as the Doctor will grant.) Which therefore in all likelihood would have been looked on by the rest of the Catholick Bishops, as a proud usurpation, and being against their common interest, to let the Pope pretend to an Universal Pastorship, ought in all reason to have engaged them in the *Ravennates* quarrel: Is there any news of such an Universal siding? Not a word: By which one may, at least, conjecture, That they thought the Popes pretence to the *Primacy*, lawful.

How did the *Ravennates* behave themselves in the business? Did they stick close to, and constantly claim their non subjection to the Pope, from Canons or Scripture?

Nothing less: They recanted often and acknowledged

knowledged subjection, as the Doctor grants,
C. 5. S. 12. and says they did it, sometimes out of fear of other enemies, sometimes *out of friendship*, or *despite to their own Clergy*; yet the people (adds the Doctor) thought themselves injured. Well, but what said the Governors of the world all this while, to whom it appertained to see Justice rightly administred: How did the Emperor *Justinian*, the then Head of the Church (as the Doctor will have it) decide the Controversie, when he came to conclude it? He vindicated the Pope, and punished most severely the people of *Ravenna*; banished the Bishop, and in a judiciary manner put the ring-leaders of the *Schism* to death at *Constantinople*, whither they were carried bound. What a pitiful Controvertist then, is this Doctor, to alleage the bare fact of a turbulent, rebellious, never-quiet City, against the justly-presumed acknowledgment, and the unanimous belief both of the then-present, and future Christian World: Lastly, against the decision of those who were their Temporal Lords, and lawful Judges; and (according to the Doctors grounds) against the *verdict of the Head of the*
C. 7. S. 20. *Church, to whom the rightful power in those matters legally pertained.*

C. 6. S. 13. His fourth Instance is out of *Balsamon* (an enemy to the See of *Rome*, and a writer for the Greeks against it) who says, *That some Arch-Bishopricks had from the Emperors Charter, that priviledge, not to be subject to the Patriarch of* Constantinople. Where, first, if we may trust *Balsamon*, who seems in this very place and Treatise, to plead for the Greeks against the Bishop of *Rome*, then Mr. Doctor, you know

your

your double task, necessary to make good your premises, ere you can conclude any thing; to wit, that the Emperors did it with order from the Church; or, in case they did nor, that it was done lawfully. Next, does the Testimony say, That the Emperor privileged them from subjection to the Pope, as Head of the Church? if not, there is no hurt at all done to our question; if it did, there had not been much, since an enemies saying, is no slander.

His fifth instance is, That *under* Phocas *the Patriarchate of* Grado, *in* Italy, *was erected*. Where first it seems, The Testimony says not it was done by him, but *under him*, or, while he reigned; and then, for any thing, you can conclude from hence, *The Pope did it in* Phocas *his reign*. Secondly, since it was not indeed *of new erected*, but translated thither from *Aquileia*, burned not long before by the *Longobards*; it was no sign of a presumed Jurisdiction, but rather of a pious generosity (whether in *Phocas* or *Charls* the Great) to bestow a new seat on the destitute Patriarch. To omit, that in the Council of *Grado*, was read the Epistle of Pope *Pelagius* the second, granting to *Elias* of *Grado* the place of the Patriarch of *Aquileia*. The Doctor did wisely then to put *under Phocas*, in stead of *by Phocas*, that so he might seem to intimate by ambiguity, what he durst not speak out for want of evidence. Ibid.

SECT.

Sect. 5.

The Doctors Testimonies from Councils and Histories, found to be partly against himself, partly frivolous, and to no purpose.

C. 6. S. 14. After his *Evidence*, from a forged Rescript and a tumultuous rable, That the right of erecting *Patriarchates* belongs to the Secular Power; and that this in the *Western* part of Christianity, was an ordinary custom; he proceeds to shew, That this was a frequent usage in the *East* also; citing for it, no less authority then that highest one of *General Councils*. Sacred Witnesses! Whom to abuse, by imposing on them a false meaning, borders upon Prophaneness.

The first Testimony is, from the Twelfth Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, where there is mention made of πόλεις διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν τὸ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἀξίωμα τιμηθεῖσας. *Cities honored by Letters Patents from the Kings or Emperors, with the name and dignities of Metropolisses*; where (saith the Doctor) *the Council represses the ambition of the Bishops, but not cassates the Rescripts, nor withdraws the honor from the Metropolis so erected.* What cause the Doctor hath to brag of those newly-erected *Metropolitans*, we shall presently shew. He proceeds, That *Balsamon* saith, many Emperors had erected many *Metropolitans*, and that they did κατ' ἀξίαν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν, according to the power

power that was given them. Thus far the Doctor; whereas,

First the Council says onely that those Cities were honored with τῷ ὀνόματι, *the Name* alone, which the Doctor, fluent in his expressions, Englishes the *Name and Dignity*; the later whereof they wanted, that which should dignifie them in a degree of a *Metropolitan*, being absolutely interdicted them by this very *Canon*, in these words, μόνης ἀπολαυέτωσαν τῆς τιμῆς, *let them enjoy onely the honor*. Secondly, What this honor was, your friend *Balsamon* tells you; saying, *Some desired to know what that honor mean't*; καὶ ἔμαθον, and *received answer*, ὅτι πλὴν τοῦ καλεῖσθαι τὴν ὁπισκοπὴν μητρόπολιν, κατὰ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ὑπόκεισθαι αὐτὴν τῇ παλαιᾷ μητροπόλει ὀφείλει, that *except onely that this Bishoprick was called a Metropolis, in all other things it was subject to the former Metropolis*. Thirdly, answerable to this are the very words in the Council, calling the former *Metropolis* in contradistinction to this, ἡ κατ' ἀλήθειαν μητρόπολις, *the true Metropolis*, signifying the other to be *meerly titular*. Fourthly, our question being, whether the Emperor could give *Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction*, not whether he could name places as he pleases; and it being evident hence, that either the Emperor never gave any *Jurisdiction* to the new *Metropolis*, or if he did, it was *cassated by the Council*, nothing follows against us, but totally against your self: now that they had no new Jurisdiction given them, is manifest out of the former place in *Balsamon*, saying, *the Episcopacy was onely called a Metropolis*; to which he subjoyns, ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος ὁπισκοπος πρὸς τὴν παλαιὰν μητρόπολιν χειροτονηθήσεται, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν κατ-

θήσεται, καὶ ἁπλῶς αὐτῷ ὑποκείσεται. *For the Bishop of it* (this new Metropolis) *shall be ordained by the old Metropolitan, and shall be judged by him, and in plain terms shall be subject to him.* Fifthly, *Balsamon* tells us, the Emperors did this *according to the power that was given them,* which words the *Doctor* cites; but leaves out a thing called ἄνωθεν, rendred by the Interpreter *Olim*, that is, *once, formerly,* or by *some precedent Council*; which *Balsamon* in that very place, judges to have been the eight and thirtieth *Canon* in *Trullo*; as shall be more clearly manifested hereafter. The sum then of this first Testimony, is, That the Emperor conferred onely *a name or title*, and that not without power given by the *Church in her Councils*; both which are perfectly innocent to our cause, and prejudicial to the Alleagers.

Ibid. His first Observation hereupon, is, *That this Council was within twenty years after that Grant of* Valentinian; *and consequently* (saith the Doctor) *if* Balsamon *say right, That at that time many Emperors had erected many, there must needs be others before* Valentinian. Where the Observer is faln into a great mistake. *Balsamons* words are these, τοῦτα τοῦ κανόνος διοριζομένου ἔνπη τὶς, καὶ πῶς διάφοροι βασιλεῖς διαφόρους ἐπισκοπὰς εἰς μητροπόλεις ἐτίμησαν; αὐτίκα γὰρ ἡ μητρόπολις Λακεδαιμονίας, &c. *The Canon determining these things, may some one say, How then have divers Kings honored divers Episcopacies to be Metropolitans: For now the Metropolis of* Lacedemonia *was a Bishoprick of the Metropolis of old* PATRÆ, Madita *of* Heraclea, Abydus *of* Cyricum; *and other Bishopricks also were honored. It seems therefore to me, from the eight and thirtieth*

Canon

Canon, &c. Where (to omit that *Balsamon* in the first part of this Testimony, intimates, That Kings may be checkt in such things by Councils, and not freed from that check, but from some Concession of another Council) the words are plain, That *Balsamon* speaks of his own times, in which he lived, that is, Six hundred years after the Council; and that then such and such *Metropolitans* were made, not of the time, when the Council was held. But the Observation is not much worth arguing or clearing.

His second Observation, is, That the seventeenth *Canon* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, doth more expresly attribute this power to the Prince, saying, Ἐι δὲ καὶ τις ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐκαινίσθη πόλις ἢ ἄυθις καινισθείη, τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παροικιῶν ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθείτω. *If any City be built or restored by the Kings power, let the Ecclesiastical order follow the Political.* Thus the Doctor walks up and down, and yet at the same time disputes against motion: He is to prove, That it is the Kings proper right, independent of the Church or her Canons, to transfer the Ecclesiastical Dignities according to his political orders; and he brings for proof, a Canon of a Council, or the Church constituting and ordaining it; which shews that the matter depended upon the Ecclesiastical state: And he calls that a *more express attributing this power to the Prince*, which is indeed not *attribuere* but *tribuere*; not an acknowledgment of it, but a bestowing and conferring it. Ibid.

This is most evident to the eye of any one who can read Greek, out of the *Scholion* of your

Friend *Balsamon* upon the eight and thirtieth Canon in *Trullo*; which *Scholion* you quote here, as if it were to your purpose, and which very Canon you alleage here for your self in these words, *And the same power is acknowledged to belong to the Prince by the Council in* Trullo, *Can.* 38. Upon which Canon, *Balsamon* saith thus, Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ παρῶν κανὼν διορίζεται τὰς διὰ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἀνεργηθεῖσας πόλεις, &c. *But since the present Canon defines that those Cities which are erected, or shall be erected by the Emperor, be honored also by Churches conformably to the Emperors disposition,* φάμεν ὡς ἐνεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ παρόντος κανόνος τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐπισκοπὰς ποιεῖν ἐκ νέου, ἑτέρας δὲ ἀνάγειν εἰς δίκαια μητροπόλεως καὶ ὑποτυπουῶ τὰ περὶ τῆς ψήφου αὐτῷ καὶ τῆς ἄλλης οἰκονομίας κατὰ τὸ δόξαν αὐτῷ. *We say* (saith *Balsamon*) *that also BY THE PRESENT CANON IT IS GIVEN TO THE EMPEROR to make new Bishopricks, and raise others to the right of Metropolitans; and to ordain concerning their election and administration, as it shall seem good to him.* And a little after he recites an Edict of the Emperor to that purpose, in which are found these words, Ἡ βασιλεία μου καὶ ἡ βασιλικὴ ἐξουσία, τὸ παρὰ τῶν θείων κανόνων δεδομένον ταύτῃ προνόμιον παροράσθαι μὴ θέλουσα, εὐδόκες, &c. *My Imperial power not suffering THE PRIVILEDGE WHICH IS GRANTED IT BY THE DIVINE CANONS to be neglected, ordains, &c.* Was ever good man so mistaken as to cite such places, which, lookt into, are as expressly against him, as if they were coyn'd purposely in defiance of his doctrine? Yet he, forgetting the question, runs on with a long Testimony, That

the Emperors could do it οἰκόθεν and αὐθόρμητος γεγονὼς, *of his own motion, and without the ambitious sollicitation of them that sought it.* Whereas the question is not upon what terms it was lawful, for the Emperor to give it; but whether it were his own proper power annext to him, as Head of the Church, sollicited or not sollicited, to give it at all, and erect such Metropolitans at pleasure; or rather, whether it were an indulgence or priviledge, granted and given him by the Church in her Canons: Which last is our *tenet*, and most evidently visible in the very Testimonies alleaged against us.

His second Testimony (for the two last were onely his *over-sights* or *observations*) begins after the old strain thus: *And ACCORDINGLY the same* Balsamon (on *Conc. Carthag. Can. 16.*) *doth upon that Canon professedly found the Authority of Princes* ἐπισκοπὴν εἰς μητροπολιν ἄγειν — καὶ ἐκ νέου ἐπισκόπους καὶ μητροπολίτας καθιστᾶν *to advance an Episcopal See into a Metropolis, and a new to constitute Bishops and Metropolitans.* Thus far the Doctor: Where he is over head and ears again in a grievous mistake; for neither doth *Balsamon* found the Authority of Princes to execute such Acts, as of their own power, on that *Canon*, there being not a word in it to that purpose: Neither doth he *PROFESSEDLY* say any thing as of himself, but that you are *PROFESSEDLY* mistaken: And had he said it, I conceive it no such strong Argument, That a professed Adversary should speak so professedly against one. But indeed, neither he nor the Canon say any such matter. The Canon not so much as names, either *Episcopal* or *Metropolical Sees*; but the main business there treated, is, Ibid.

That Bishops and Priests should not live upon base occupations, nor employ themselves in secular businesses: Which *Balsamon* in his *Scholion* or *Comment*, more elucidates from like prohibitions of other *Patriarchs*; adding in the end out of other mens opinions, and not his own *profession*, these words, Λέγουσι δέ τινες ταῦτα μὲν χώραν ἔχειν ὅταν δίχα προστάξεως βασιλικῆς ἐνεργῆ τὶς ἱερωμένος δουλείαν δημοσιακήν. ——*But some say these Canons or Constitutions take place, when any one, who hath taken holy Orders, shall exercise a secular Ministery without the command of the Emperor.* ——Καὶ προστιθέασιν ὅτι ὁ βασιλεὺς οὔτε νόμοις οὔτε κανόσιν ὑπόκειται, διὸ καὶ ἐπ' ἀδείας ἔχει ἐπισκοπὴν εἰς μητρόπολιν ἄγειν, καὶ ἀποξενοῦν ἐκ τῶν οἰκείων μητροπόλεων ——καὶ ἐκ νέου ἐπισκόπους καὶ μητροπολίτας καθιστᾶν, &c. *And they adde* (saith *Balsamon*) *that the King is neither under Laws nor Canons; and therefore he may securely make a Bishoprick a Metropolis, &c.* ——*and anew constitute Bishops and Metropolitans:* Where the Reader may see he introduces this as a deduction of others; and that from no other grounds then this, *A King is neither bound by Canons nor Laws*; that is, his Will is his Law, or he may do lawfully what he lists; and then indeed (these grounds supposed) I blame not the inference that he should erect, transplant, nay, pull down, not only *Bishops* and *Patriarchs*, but the whole *Hierarchy* it self (your present lot, consequent to these your grounds.)

Thus at length we have found the bottom-stone of the Doctors grounds, *Why Kings may erect Patriarchates* by their proper power, not to be *Councils*, as he pretended; but their own all-lawful inerrableness to do what they please,

let

let *Councils*, *Canons*, *Parliaments*, and *Laws* say what they will to the contrary. A foundation fitting indeed to build the Doctors Assertion upon, but in all other respects, able to ruine and overthrow both *Laws*, *Commonwealths*, *Canons*, and *Church*.

In his fifteenth Section, persisting still in his feigned supposal, That the Popes power is onely Patriarchal; he goes on to prove, that the antiquity of *translating Patriarchs and Bishops* belongs to Kings, as well as of erecting. Of which he gives some instances in our *Country* of *England*: By which, what he means to prove, I cannot easily conjecture. If he intends that Kings did oft do such things, I wonder who denies it; but if they did it by their proper right, without the order or consent, either of the *Apostolical See*, or the *Ecclesiastical State* of his own *Bishops*; he brings not one word in proof, but rather expresly manifests the contrary from the carriage of St. *Anselm*, then *Archbishop* of *Canterbury*, as learned and pious a Prelate as that age produced; who (as the Doctor confesses) when the King would have cut off as much from the Diocess of *Lincoln*, as would make a new Bishoprick at *Ely*, Anselm *wrote to Pope* Paschalis, *desiring his consent to it*; *assuring him he would not give his consent, but salvâ* authoritate Papæ, *the authority of the Pope being secured.* Where you see plainly, the Archbishops consent was necessary, and that without it, the Kings desire seemed controlable: Next, that the Archbishop himself, even with the Kings authority to back him, would not venture on it till the Pope's consent was asked. C. 6. S. 15, 16.

Here then Mr. Doctor you have a positive Testimony of the gravest Prelate our Country hath ever been honored with, refusing the sufficiency of the Kings sole authority to conclude such businesses, without his, and the Popes consent; which therefore more justly challenges audience in the Court of Reason, then all your dumb Negatives, though they were a thousand more.

To conclude, in what your Testimonies were Positive, to wit, that such things were done *de facto*, so far we yeeld to them; in what they are Negative, tacitly inferring, that because they were done, and no mans right named, therefore they were done *de jure*, by the proper right of him that did them: So far we allow them no credit at all.

First, Because they might have been performed by the secular Authorities, either with consent of the Bishops, or some indulgent grant of the Church to pious *Princes*; or, by order from the Pope; or else, Concession of some former Council; an example of which, we had lately in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*.

Next, because Histories, intending onely to relate matters of fact, mention rather those that put things in execution, and more visibly appear in the transacting them, such as are *Secular Magistrates*; and stand not scanning or debating much, by whose *right* things were done; which belongs to Lawyers, and would be but a by-discourse hindering the orderly process of their Narrative strain.

Thirdly, because every one who hath the least smack of Logick knows, *A Negative Argument proves nothing*, such as are all yours here

alleaged.

alleaged. For this is the tenor of them, *Historians say, Some Kings translated some Patriarchates, and it is not mentioned, they did it by the Churches power; therefore they did it by their own*; which will be found in good Logick, to fall very far short of concluding.

Lastly, because the *Church* ever challenged, as her own proper right, asserted to her by the *Canons*, the jurisdiction and power, to intermeddle in businesses purely Ecclesiastical.

In his seventeenth Paragraph he proposes two other Objections of the same nature with the rest. The first, in common, that the King could exempt from Episcopal Jurisdiction, which he says is largely asserted and exemplified in *Goudrayes* case, 5 *Report.* 14. And truly the Doctor is to be commended for his fair and sincere expression. For it is indeed meerly asserted and exemplified without the least shadow of proof. *C. 6. S. 17.*

In the first example there alleaged, King *Kenulphus* is said to have exempted a Monastery, *Consilio & consensu Episcoporum & Senatorum Gentis suæ*, which was no instance of power in him, unless it was also in the Bishops and Nobles, That he could not, or would not do it without their agreement.

The exemption of *Reading* Abbey, by *Henry* the First, argues no authority, he being the Founder of it, and not bound to give his goods to the *Church*, but upon the conditions which pleases himself. Which answer likewise serves for all Hospitals, and such like pious Houses founded by the King.

The third example of the Abbot of *Buries* exemption by the King, is Recorded without particular

particular circumstances, and so must stand for an example of the Kings execution or command, to the secular Magistrate, to proceed accordingly, but proves nothing, That the King did it without consent of the Bishop, under whom it was.

These are all the cases of secular exemptions, produced by that learned Lawyer, which you see are pure examples of the Kings exempting, either with the Bishops consent, or by title of asking, what conditions he thought fit to annex to his own Liberalities, as every private person may, or at most alleaged so abstractedly, that any of these, or many other causes, may justly be supposed to have intervened. But I mistake, there is yet one more, to which the Doctor thought good to give a particular efficacy, by citing the very words of the Charter, which are these, *Hoc regali authoritate & Episcoporum ac Baronum attestatione constituo. I appoint this by my royal Authority with the attestation of my Bishops and Barons.* But had the Doctor remembred he had named this King, before *William* the Conqueror, he would have understood that *Regali Authoritate*, signified as much as in the first of Kings doth that famous phrase *Jus Regis*, that is, the power of the sword, the power of taking away any mans goods, and giving them to another; the power of doing all wrong, as is not onely known of the Conquerors other proceedings, but even out of this fact, taking the goods of a Bishop, and the provision ordained for Souls, and attributing them to an Abbey: And this by the very words of the Charter, without any course of Law or consent of any Justice, or power in the Com-

Commonwealth: So that our Doctor has brought us in a very special example for *Henry* the Eighth, the worst of his Successors to imitate, and justifie his Spiritual Authority by.

To that which he affirms of the Catholick *German* Emperors, the Kings of *France* and *England*; that they claimed *to be founders of all Bishopricks in their Dominions, and Patrons of them to bestow them by investiture*: I answer, they did very well to found as many as they pleased, that is, to enrich and enlarge the Church with Episcopal Revenues by their pious Donations; and when they have done, to claim deservedly the Advowsons, and present whom they please to be invested by the Church; whom yet, if they be found unworthy, the Church rejects, notwithstanding the Kings presentation and authority, and consequently this is done by the consent of the Church: Neither is this annexed to the Kingly dignity onely, as a particular badg of his Authority over the Church; but even private Subjects, when either themselves or their Ancestors have founded some Ecclesiastical Benefice, challenge to themselves the Advowsons, without any prejudice to the Church; who allows it reasonable, that the Friends of the Donors should rather enjoy that benefit, then others. Unless, perhaps, the persons be found unfit; which in that case, obliges the Church to use her Authority, by interposing her refusal. This therefore private persons can do, as well as Kings, and yet, I hope, the Doctor will not say, That all those are Lords and Heads of the Church. Lastly, he might as well have made mention of the Pope and Clergies resistance to Kings that usurped

C. 6. S. 18.

usurped the *investitures*, as of the others claiming of them; both being equally notorious in History, and the Princes in the end, having yeelded that their pretence was unjust.

Ibid. Next he tells us, the Kings of *France* and *England*, *claimed a just right, that no Legate from* Rome *could use Jurisdiction here, without their leave.* What a terrible business is this? Or, what follows hence? None can imagine but the Dr. himself, who certainly had some meaning in it, or other; They did so indeed; and so do *Catholick* Kings sometimes to this day; who yet communicate with the *Church*, and are accounted obedient sons, as long as they proceed with due moderation. But that they did it in disacknowledgment of the Popes Supremacy; or, that the *Legate* brought not his Jurisdiction with him from *Rome*, but was glad to receive it of the King, ere he could use it, this the Doctor will never be able to make good. Nay, they were so far from denying the Popes Authority even in this kinde, That our Kings of *England* procured of the Pope, that the Archbishop of *Canterbury* should be *Legatus Natus*.

Ibid. But now the Doctor hath resolved me of my former doubt, which was, with what art possible he could make these imperfect Testimonies serve his purpose; adding here immediately these words, *All these put together, are a foundation for this power of the Princes, to erect or translate a Patriarchate.* As if he should have said, *Though there be not one word in any single Testimony expressly manifesting, That it is principally the Kings power, or excluding the Churches; yet I have produced many things little to the purpose* (if considered in their single selves) *which, notwithstanding I*

would

would intreat you to believe, that ALL THESE PUT TOGETHER ARE A FOUNDATION, &c. Where note, that here again also he observes his former invincible method of reserving his strongest Arguments till the last; putting immediately before his Conclusion, That the Legates were often not admitted in *England*; so as out of the very non-admission of the *Legates*, the Doctor infers an absolute *power in Princes, to erect and translate Patriarchates*. Besides, were all this granted, what is it to your, or our purpose; since we accuse you not of *Schism*, for breaking from the Popes subjection, as a private Patriarch, but as the chief Pastor and Head of the Church.

But, because the Doctor could not handsomly transfer this Primacy from *Rome* to *Canterbury*, to secure him from the subjection to *Antichrist*; therefore he was pleased to mistake it, all along this Chapter, for a *Patriarchate*; and then undertakes to shew from some few Testimonies *de facto*, That it was not the *Churches*, but the *Kings Authority* to erect and translate them. Whereas (besides the answers in particular already given) no prudent man can doubt, but in the process of fifteen or sixteen hundred years, and in such a vast extent as the *Christian* world, there may be found twenty or thirty matters of Fact (if one will take Histories to collect them) either out of ambition, ignorance, rebellion, or tyranny, against the most inviolable right that can be imagined.

Besides, many things might often be mentioned, by Historiographers, as done, without particularizing the Authority, by which they were done. Especially in our case; where, by reason

reason of the connexion between the Soul and Body of the politick world; the Ecclesiastical and Secular State; they seem to act as one thing: The *Temporal Authority* most commonly putting in execution the intentions of the *Church*. And this also makes them appear more visibly to proceed from the Temporal part, then from the Spiritual; as humane actions more *apparently* spring from the Body, then from the Soul. But if the Doctor would have proved sincerely, That Kings indeed had that pretended power, he should not have stood piddling with half a dozen fag ends of History, to prove such a thing was sometimes done *de facto*, but recurred to the *Apostolical* and *Ecclesiastical Canons*, where such things are purposely treated, and there he should have found another story. But he is wiser then to confine himself within the proper lists of any question; he had rather be in the open field, where his little fiery-reason may hop and skip from hough to bryar; and weary his adversary not to combate, but to catch him.

SECT.

Sect. 6.

The Examination of the Testimonies produced by Mr. Hammond *to prove his fundamental Position, that Kings are supreme in spiritual matters:*

THe endeavours of Mr. *Hammond* in the foregoing part of this Chapter was first, to suppose the Pope onely a private *Patriarch*; next, that the King can erect and translate *Patriarchates*; after which (though other men of reason use to put their grounds, ere they deduce any thing from them) he lays the grounds in this 19 Paragraph of his formerly built discourse, saying, that the Reason of all is, *the supreme power of Kings, even in Ecclesiastical matters.* Where, (to omit how he has mangled that one poor Paragraph with ten *parentheses*, no more) he so intermingles and shuffles together, in an equal tenor, truths with falshoods, things dubious and unprov'd, with things acknowledged, and that need no proof, things to the purpose, with things to no purpose, that it would loath any well-order'd Reason, to see in so little a room, so perfect a map of disorderly confusion. But ere we come to answer that; his marginal testimonies which he huddles together briefly of all sorts, would seem neglected, if we should not allow them a cursory reflection. *C. 6. S. 19.*

First, what he objects out of *Chemnitius*, though his Author were of any Authority, yet it

it makes nothing at all to his purpose; since the very words he cites, that *the King is as it were the common Director and Ruler of the Church*, signifies rather he was not so, then was so; unless he can prove that *quasi*, *as it were*, can bear the sence of *revera*, *indeed*, or *in reality*. And then how handsomely think you, would these words hang together, that *the King is IN REALITY AS IT WERE*, the *Ruler of the Church*. Nay rather the words alledged plainly signifie the contrary: For, if there be a common Ruler of the Church, and the King be onely *as it were* that Ruler; it is plain, there is some other, not, *as it were*, but *truly* and *properly* such.

The second is yet much more absurd; for never was there Testimony, nor can be imagined in so little room, more expresly witnessing, that Kings have nothing to do with Ecclesiastical affairs then this of *Constantine*; which the Doctor brings to prove the contrary. I mean if we take the words as the Doctor cites them in Greek, without his canting translation of them. The words are these, Ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω ἐκκλησίας ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθεσταμένος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἴην. In English thus, as neer word by word as it can possibly be render'd. *You truly* (speaking to the Bishops) *are constituted Overseers (or Bishops) of those affairs which are within the Church; but I am constituted under God Overseer of those affairs which are without the Church.* But the Doctor seems willing to take there *the* word ἐκκλησία or *Church*, for a *material Church* of stone, and so renders τὰ εἴσω ἐκκλησίας, *those things which are celebrated within it*; Yet is pittifully puzled notwithstanding, rendering τὰ ἐκτὸς ἐκκλησίας

(which

(which signifies *things without the Church*) *external things*; because the right words would have excluded the Emperors power over Ecclesiastical affairs; and yet even so it will not serve his turn; for unless he can make his own words (*external things*) signifie *spiritual things*, to which they will be very unwilling, the Testimony is still expresly against him.

Besides, it is pretty sport to observe how fillily insincere the Doctor is, telling us that *Constantine the Great spake those words in an Assembly of Bishops*; by which and the Doctors wrong Translation, the simple Reader would judge that *Constantine* had told a General Council of Bishops to their face, that he was Head of the Church: but when I came to finde out the Author and the place (both which the Doctor had prudently omitted) I found it was onely spoken when *he was at dinner with some Bishops*. The Author is *Eusebius*, *de vita Constantini*, l. 4. c. 24. The title of the Chapter is this, as I finde it in the Translator, (for I had not the Greek) *Quod externarum rerum quasi Episcopum se quendam professus est*, That he professed himself, as it were a kinde of a *Bishop* over external things. Then follows the Chapter in these words. *Ex quo etiam factum est, ut cum Episcopos nonnullos convivio excepisset, ipse se nobis audientibus Episcopum appellaret, his ferè verbis: Vos, (inquit) intra Ecclesiam, ego extra Ecclesiam à Deo Episcopus constitutus sum. Itaque cum quæ loquebatur eadem secum mente cogitaret, animum in omnes qui ejus subeant imperio intentum habuit, hortatus pro virili utpiam omnes vitam excolerent.* Whence it came to pass, that when he had entertained some Bishops at a feast (or Banquet) he in our hearing, called him-

self a Bishop in those words: *You* (saith he) *are constituted Bishops within the Church, I without the Church. Wherefore since his thought went along with his words, he apply'd his mind to those who were under his Empire, exhorting them, to his power, that they should all lead a pious life.* Where, besides what I formerly found the Doctor faulty in, we see that the Author of this Testimony, who was present, when the Emperor spake these words, and so could best judge of his meaning by the circumstances, deduced no more out of them, then that he called himself Bishop, because it belonged to his Calling *to exhort all his subjects to lead a pious life*, and administer rightly those things of which they were *Overseers* by God.

His third Testimony to prove the King *Head* of Ecclesiastical, as well as civil affairs, is, that *irreprehended saying* of *Leo Isaurus*, who said to the *Pope*, Ἐγὼ μὲν βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεύς εἰμι, *I am a King and a Priest*, which was indeed a saying worthy an Anti-heretick, as *Isaurus* was; being a ring-leader of the *Iconoclasts*. A wise man would wonder what the Doctor intended by producing such a saying, which himself must acknowledge extravagant: since none of the late Kings of *England* ever assum'd to themselves the title of a Priest, as did this infatuated *Emperor*; who gave more credit to Sooth-sayers and fortune-tellers, then to God and his Church.

The third is from *Socrates*, who says, *the affairs of the Church depended on the Emperors*. And who denies it? Therefore what? *Ergo* Kings are supreme in Ecclesiastical affairs? How follows that? since the onely word is wanting, to wit, *supreme*, which can make good the inference. The affairs of the Head depend on the

Arms

Arms and Shoulders; therefore will the Doctor infer they are *supreme* or highest? as though dependence could not be both mutual and unequal. It must needs argue a Soul very empty of reason, to catch thus at every shadow of any airy word, and think to deduce thence a full sentence.

The fourth is from *Optatus*, noting it as a *schismatical* piece of language in the Donatists to say, *Quod Imperatori cum Ecclesiâ?* What has the Emperor to do with the Church, citing for it his second Book. But (though perhaps I may be mistaken in not seeing so small a Testimony) I finde no such thing in that place he quotes. Indeed I finde that ancient Father arguing like a present Catholike, calling the Doctor *Schismatick*, and quite confuting and contradicting all his book; saying, *Negare non potes scire te in urbe Româ PETRO PRIMO Cathedram Episcopalem esse collatam; in quâ sederit omnium APOSTOLORUM CAPUT PETRUS; Thou canst not deny that in the City of* Rome *the Episcopal Chair was given to PETER THE FIRST; in which sate PETER THE HEAD OF ALL THE APOSTLES.* Then he proceeds to reckon up all the Popes of *Rome*, successors of S. *Peter*, till Pope *Siricius*, who lived in his days, *Cum quo nobis totus orbis in commercio Formatorum in una Communionis societate concordat;* ——— *With whom the whole world agrees in one society of Communion, by correspondence of communicatory Letters.* —— And afterwards, *probatum est nos esse in Ecclesiâ Sanctâ Catholicâ* —— *per Cathedram Petri, quæ nostra est, & per ipsam cæteras Dotes apud nos esse, etiam Sacerdotium. It is proved that we are in the holy Catholike Church by the chair of Peter,*

which is ours: (what will become of the Doctor, who can lay no claim, nor hath any right to it, nay hath disclaimed its right, and who findes here a reason why we may justly be called *Roman Catholikes*) It follows, *and by the chair of Peter, other gifts are also with us, even Priesthood.* Alas poor Doctor *Hammond*, who having lost Communion with that Church, hath lost also his Priesthood, Mission, and power to preach, if this holy Father say true. What hard fortune it was that *Optatus* lived not in the primitive times, for then the Doctor had believed him and turned *Papist*; but in regard he wrote after the three hundreth year, (the fatal period of any certain truth in Gods Church, as the Doctor afterwards intimates) he hath quite lost his labour, and his Authority is invalid for writing Truth so late. As for the Testimony it self, which probably is this Fathers in some other place, I see no difficulty at all in it: For the Emperor being *a nursing Father to the Church*, whose secular power she invoked to punish and repress such as were the Donatists; none but *Schismaticks* would deny that power so granted to be sufficiently Authoritative to punish their pernicious Apostasie.

Then follow six Testimonies out of heathen writers all in a cluster, that their Kings ought to be Priests and Augurs, &c. and the Doctor would have the example transfer'd to Christianity. Indeed if *Jesus Christ* had not come from heaven to found a Church, and (besides what hath been said of *St. Peters* Primacy) left it under the Government of Ecclesiastical persons, the Apostles, committing all jurisdiction in affairs of that nature to them, without depen-

dence

dence of any secular superior; then, for any thing I know, we might have come ere this to have been *in statu quo prius*, that is, Heathens again; and so the Doctors Argument might have ta'ne place: But if Christ founded a Church upon Apostles, Ecclesiastical persons, without the help of secular supports, leaving all power both of *Ordination* and *Jurisdiction* to it, the Doctor must either prove no disparity between the sacred œconomy of Christs House, and the Babel of heathenism; or else grant his parity improper and absurd. I never imagin'd there was any such extraordinary holiness in the heathenish Rites, but a secular power might serve to perform and overlook them: And, as the reason why they were used by the Emperors, was onely because their mock-Religion was nothing but a policy to delude and bridle the vulgar; so if Christian Religion were nothing but a trick of State-policy, it would do very well indeed in a secular Princes hands, to alter and fashion it to the mold of the peoples humors. But our all-wise God hath dealt more prudently with his Church; encharging his sacred Mysteries and the Churches-Government to those persons, whose very state of life being purely dependent on God and his service, secures them from being cross-byass'd by worldly interests, and secular pretences. Yet the Doctor is so deeply immers'd in Schism, that he relishes and fancies better the Pope-destroying example of heathen policy, then the ever-sacred, and heaven-instituted Government of Christianity.

His eleventh instance is from *David* who order'd the courses of the Priests, and *Solomon* who *consecrated the Temple*; but the Doctor may

consider, that *David* and *Solomon* were *Prophets* as well as *Kings*, and so no wonder, if, according to the more particular prudence given them by God, they did something extraordinary. Neither doubt I, but if now adays any King were both a *Saint* and a *Prophet*, it were very convenient he should assist and instruct the Church in a more particular way, and yet not thank his Kingly Dignity for that Authority neither. But indeed, neither *David* nor *Solomon* shewed any strain of a higher Jurisdiction. Their greater zeal might invite them, and their exacter knowledge make their assistance requisite to *order the courses of the Priests*. And as for *Solomons Consecrating the Temple*, it was performed by offering Sacrifice; which he himself offer'd not, but the Priests; so as his Consecrating it was nothing else but his causing them to Consecrate it. A pittiful proof that Kings are over the Church in Ecclesiastical affairs.

His twelfth Testimony is of *Hezekiah* and *Josiah*, who *ordered many things belonging to the Temple*. So wonderfully acute is this Doctor, that no King can do a pious deed, or even scarce say his Prayers, but his honor-dropping-pen streight way entitles him Head of the Church.

Ibid. His thirteenth is of St. *Paul*, who (saith he) *appealed from the judgement of the chief Priests to the Tribunal of Cæsar*. So as now *Cæsar*, a Heathen Emperor, is become Head of the Church; nay of two Churches (according to Master *Hammond*) the Heathenish, and the *Christian*. But the good Doctor is most grievously mistaken here, as he hath been almost in every place of Scripture he hath yet produc't; & I observe, that though he be pretty good at mistaking all

over

over his Book, yet when he comes to alleadge any thing out of Gods Word, he errs far more accurately. For St. *Paul* appealed not from the Tribunal of the Jews, much less their Synagogue (representing their Church) as the Doctor would perswade us; but from the Tribunal of *Portius Festus*, a Roman Governor under *Cæsar*, to *Cæsar* himself; I will onely put down the words as I finde them in their own Translation, and so leave the Doctor to the Readers Judgement, either to be accused for willfully abusing, or ignorantly mistaking them: *But* Festus *willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered* Paul *and said, wilt thou go up to Jerusalem, and there be judged of these things before me: Then said* Paul, *I stand at Cæsars judgement-seat where I ought to be judged*, &c. Act. 25. 9, 10, &c. And now is not this Doctor think you the fittest man among all the sons of the Church of *England* to have a Pension for writing *Annotations in folio on the Bible.*

His last proof is, that *Justinians third Book is made up of Constitutions, de Episcopis, Clericis, Laicis; Bishops, Priests, Laymen.* First we answer, and the same may be said of the *Theodosian Code*, that all the Laws found there must not necessarily be *Justinians*; since the Keepers of the Laws use not onely to put in their Law-books those Constitutions, themselves made, but also those they are to see observed; among which are the Canons and Laws of the Church, made before by Councils and other *Ecclesiastical Powers.* Secondly, We grant *Justinian* may make Constitutions of his own concerning *Bishops*, and Clergymen, in what relates to temporal affairs, or as they are parts of the civil Com-

monwealth. And lastly, If he shall be found to have made any Laws concerning them, and without the Authority of the Church entrenching upon Ecclesiastical businesses, let the Doctor prove he had power to make such, and he will in so doing, clear him in that part, from that note of Tyranny, which is objected against him.

What you say concerning the Canons of Councils, that *they have been mostly set out by the Emperors*; It is very certain, you might, if you had pleased, instead of your *Mostly* have put *Always*, the causing them to be promulgated belonging to the Office of the supreme Secular Powers; whose obligation it is to see that the Churches decrees be received and put in execution. What you clap in within a *Parenthesis* (as your custom is to intermingle truth with falshood) that Canons of Councils *received their Authority by the Emperor*; In the sence you take it is a great error. For never was it heard that an Emperor claimed a negative voice in making a Canon of a Council valid, which concerned matters purely Spiritual; nay, nor disaccepted them, decreed unanimously by the Fathers, but all the world lookt upon him as an unjust and tyrannical incroacher. They receive indeed Authority from the Emperor in this sense, that his subscription and command to proclaim them makes them have a more powerful reception, and secures them from the obstacles of turbulent and rebellious spirits; But this will not content you, your aym is, that they should not have the Authority or validity of a Canon, without the last-life-giving-hand of the Emperors vote, which is onely a strain

of

of your own liberality to him, or rather of your envy towards the Church, without any ground of his rightful claim to any such Jurisdiction over Councils.

Sect: 7.

Other empty Proofs of this pretended Right, confuted.

These rubs being removed, it will be our next sport to address an answer to his nineteenth Section it self; where omitting his ten Parentheſisſes, which contain nothing, but either sayings of his own, or Greek out of *Strabo*'s Geography, *That the Romans kept their assizes at divers places*; or Testimonies from the Council of *Chalcedon*, already answered; omitting these, I say, I will briefly resume the whole sence of the Paragraph, as well as I can gather it out of the some-thing-more-*Lucid intervals* of his *mad Parentheſisſes*: And this I take to be the sum of it, That Kings should, according to emergent conveniences, *change their Seats of Judicature*; *C. 6. S. 19.* and that the same reasons may require a *removal of Ecclesiastical Seats*; *wherefore, there being nothing to the contrary constituted, either by Christ or his Apostles, it follows, That Kings may, when they please, erect, and consequently remove Primacies and Metropolitans.*

I answer, That Secular Courts may be removed upon good occasions, is so evident to every Fool, that it needs neither Greek, nor *Strabo* to prove

prove it. That Ecclesiastical Seats, for greater conveniences of the Church, be also subject to removal, is likewise evident and constituted by the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Can.* 17. But his inference, That it belongs to the right of Kings to erect and transfer them, is weaker then water; nor has the Doctor infused into it, the least grain of Reason to strengthen it. § 2

Yet first to prove it, he says, *Nothing is found either by Christ, or his Apostles ordered to the contrary.* Which is a most pitiful Negative proof (as indeed the greatest part of his Book is) and supposes, to make it good, That neither *Christ*, nor his Apostles, said, did, or ordered any thing but what is expresst in Scripture; which is both expressly contrary to Scripture it self, and to common reason also.

Besides, this wise proof is both most unjust towards us, and silly in him to expect; unjust towards us, ingaging us to prove out of Scripture, That Kings cannot erect *Primacies* and *Patriarchates*, whereas there is no such word there, as either *Primate* or *Patriarchate*, which he would have us shew thence not subject to Kings.

Nor is it less silly in him to expect, That the Scripture should make mention of the erection, or not erection of Primacies and Patriarchates by *Secular Powers*; since the Secular Powers, when the Scripture was written, being most bloody Tyrants and Persecutors of the Church, were more likely to hang up all *Primates* and *Patriarchs*, then either erect or remove their Seats to a more convenient place. Yet if you would see something to the contrary, why Kings should not use Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction,

I can produce you the sence of the Catholick Church, the best Testimony that can be alleaged for the meaning of Gods Spirit; but because this weighs little with you, I shew you next, the Testimony of common sence and reason, which tells you, *Faber fabrilia tractet*; and that those, whose education, institute of life, particular designment to, and total dependence on any course of life, makes them more strongly addict all their thoughts to perfect themselves knowingly and magisterially in that their proper profession, are fitter by far for such an employment, then those whose diversly-distracted studies, render them half-knowing, or half-careful in such performances.

How much then is it more convenient, that Ecclesiastical persons should manage the affairs of the Church, then Secular Princes, whom partly their necessary Temporal occasions, partly voluntary Recreations, Court attendances and entertainments, so quite take up, that they can have but faint and weak reflections, either of knowledge or care, in comparison of the others, upon the most concerning business imaginable, the ordering Gods Church.

The Doctors Conclusion then, which he says is, both *rational and evident*, is both *irrational*, and very dim-coloured to any eye but his own, who supposes (as he tells us here, for our farther confirmation) *That he hath made it already clear from the refutation of our Plea for St. Peters Universal Pastorship*; whereas, it hath been manifested, he had not one express word of proof to make good his pretended confutation; insomuch, as I promise him a general pardon, and acquittance for the frivolousness of all the rest,

if

if he can shew me in his Answer, that any one place expresly testified, that which he pretended to evidence by Testimonies.

What he adds, *That it was appointed by the Council of* Chalcedon, de jure, *that the King may erect a Primacy when he pleases.* I dare be bold to call a forgery; and that, it needs an *ID EST* of *the seventeens*, to make the Councils words sound to his purpose.

Ibid. What he tells us next, as a thing certain, *That King* Ethelbert *at the time of* Austins *planting the Faith, did erect a Primacy at* Canterbury, *the seat of his Kingdom: Imperii sui totius Metropolis*, saith *Bede*, &c. is such a childish piece of insincerity, that it craves as much pity as it deserves anger. For *Bede* onely tells us there, *How the King answered them, that he could not assent to their new doctrine; yet because they were strangers, and desired to communicate to him what they believed to be true, he would not trouble them, but rather kindly entertain them*, &c. Then follows the Doctors Testimony, *Dedit ergo eis mansionem in Civitate Dovernensi quæ Imperii sui totius erat Metropolis. Eisque, ut promiserat, cum administratione victus temporalis*, &c. *Wherefore he gave them a dwelling place in the City of* Canterbury (*the Mother-City of his whole Dominions*) *and with administration of Temporal food, he hindred them not from Preaching.* So that the giving them an House in *Canterbury* to dwell in, and meat to eat, is a clear evidence with Master *Hammond*, That the King (yet a Heathen) erected a *Primacy*, when certainly he knew not then what a *Primacy* meant.

Lastly, To convince absolutely, That Kings were Heads of the Church, and translated and

erected

erected *Primacies* at pleasure, he concludes, *That had it not been for this, there is no reason assignable, why this Nation being in* Constantine's *time, under three Metropolitans, there should be an addition of two Provinces; or that the Metropolitical power should be so removed.* As if it could not be done at all, unless the King did it. What an Argument is here, to bring for an up-shot of his proofs, That the King is Head of the *Church*? We both acknowledge, that some removals of Ecclesiastical Seats have been in *England*; but the Question is, Whether it belongs to the Kings, or the Popes, to cause these removals; he undertakes to prove it the Kings right, we deny it. The Doctor produces his *Sacra Anchora*, or last proof, *That there is no reason assignable why these Sees were removed, had it not been that the King had power*: We answer, We can tell how to remove them without the Kings power, to wit, by the Popes; which is the question he professes to make head against: But proceeds not farther, then onely to say it must *needs be the King, and that we cannot assign the Pope*; and that the thing was done, and therefore the King must necessarily be the doer of it. Thus you see the Doctor is constant to his Principles, in putting his strongest Arguments in the rear. What man living is able to withstand so potent and cunning an Adversary?

Besides, suppose there had been neither Pope nor King, was there any impossibility that consent of Bishops might remove the *Primacy* to another See? especially, the Bishops being anciently of such Authority in *England*, That no weighty affairs were transacted, but they had a share in the managing of them. You see then

Mr.

Mr. Doctor there are *two reasons assignable* for the fact, which you prove to be the Kings power, because he did it, and then prove he did it, because otherwise it could not have been done.

After he hath thus convinc't Kings to have power also over *Ecclesiastical* affairs, he proceeds to prove, that this power of theirs (taken away by the Laws) *is resumable*: and, although his supposition being shown to be groundless, there needs no answer to what he builds upon it, yet we will not be so discourteous as to slight his mistakes by affording them no Reply.

C. 6. S. 20.

Under Pope *Melchiades* in *Constantines* time was made a Decree, that if the Donatist Bishops in *Africk* would return to the Unity of the Church, they should be allowed either to keep the Bishopricks they had, or be provided of others: their obstinacy permitted not this to be executed, and therefore it was recalled. Neer a hundred years after under Pope *Anastasius*, a National Council in *Africa* ordained a request to Him and other Bishops of *Italy*, by whose predecessors the revocation had been made, that the Donatist Bishops might retain their places if they would return to the Catholike Church; the cunning *Balsamon* puts the provision in self for a Canon of this Council; and it had been a foul offence in the Doctor to have taken notice of the request, though he must needs have read it in *Baronius*, whom he cites in the very place. Therefore he concludes, that Laws made at *Rome* do not take away the liberty of another National Council to make contrary Laws thereunto. Although as far as can be drawn out of the fact and Council, it argues

the

the direct contrary, and that it was not lawful, for their National Council to infringe what had been done at *Rome*: so unlucky is the Doctor in bringing Arguments so restiff and kicking, that they cast their rider out of his intent.

He tells next, that *a Law though made by a General Council and with the consent of all Christian Princes, yet, if it have respect to a civil right, may in this or that Nation be repealed*; quoting one *Roger Widrington* and *Suarez*; the latter of them, gives this reason; *because such a Law made at a general meeting of Princes, is intrinsically a civil Law.* But what the Doctor will do with this after he hath produced it I cannot certainly say, onely I see he must be very fruitful in unproved suppositions, ere it will be able to do him or his cause any good. First, he must suppose that the title of the *Head of the Church* is a thing not *Ecclesiastical*, but belonging to a *civil right*; next, that that same title is denyed their Kings, only upon pretence of a Canon of a Council, and not upon Christs *donation* of it to St. *Peter*; these two unproved and ungranted positions (I say) he must suppose *gratis*. Otherwise to what end does he argue that the Canons of Councils are repealable and the Kings right by consequence resumeable. C. 6. S. 22.

What follows next in the 23 Section, that *this is affirmed and intended by* Balsamon *to all Canons in general, as the judgement of learned men, in his notes on the sixteenth Canon of the Council of* Carthage, hath already been answered, and shown that it is not *Balsamon* who affirms it, but other men; neither doth he call them learned men, as the Doctor here imposes on him, but onely says, *that some men say the Emperor can* C. 6. S. 23.

do

do such and such things. And he adds, that those persons proceed upon this ground, that the Emperor may do lawfully whatever he lists.

His last Paragraph, for which (as his former custom was) he reserves the best of his strength, proves that this right of Kings to be head in Ecclesiastical affairs, cannot be alienated by prescription. The testimony he introduces is of one *Sayr*, a late Monk, who wrote his Book at *Rome*; a man likely to speak much in the Doctors behalf; whose opinion, in case he should say any thing against us, being but of a private Casuist, may with the like facility be rejected as alleadg'd; But what says honest *Sayr?* he tells us, that *when prescription is neither of the Law of Nature, nor the divine Law, nor the Law of Nations, but onely the civil and Canon Law, there it extends no farther then every supreme Prince in his Realm by his Law is supposed to will that it shall be extended, and therefore that no subject can prescribe exemption from making appeal to his King, or that his Prince may not punish him when Reason and Justice requires.* Let the testimony it self be what it will, what was the Doctor dreaming on when he produced it? Marry he dreamt two things; First, that the Pope had heretofore prescribed against the Kings of *England* in their pretended right of being head in *Ecclesiastical matters*; next this prescription of the Pope hath not its force from any thing but a Canon or *Civil Law.* These two points the Doctor dreamingly supposes to be certain principles, and it is discourtesie in us not to grant them *gratis*, for fear we should spoil his learned Conclusion. What a shame is this for a Doctor of Divinity, (whereas every boy that hath been

but

but two years at *Cambridge*, knows he is first to establish his premises firmly, ere he can claim any certainty of truth in his Conclusion) to suppose his premises true, and upon that grant, kindly made by himself to himself, conclude at pleasure what he lists. And what an unconscionable piece of affected ignorance is this, to bring a Testimony which could not possibly be applyed to his purpose without proving the two former self-made suppositions; and yet to neglect that necessary task, and conclude in these vain words, *It were ease to apply this distinctly to the confirming of all that hath been said, but I shall not expatiate.* It is now become an old excuse with the Doctor to cry he is out of his way, when he comes to a passage he cannot get over; but all-to-be-labours things frivolous, and which (his self-laid grounds once supposed) would be out of question.

Thus you see an end of his sixth Chapter, which was totally built upon this ground, that the Authority of Head of the Church was no more then *Patriarchal*, and consequently needed in rigour of dispute no other reply but onely to deny the supposition, and bid him prove it. What has been answered to each particular, was onely to let the Reader see how inconsequently and weakly he builds, even upon his own foundations.

SECT. 8.

A Reply to Doctor Hammonds *Narrative or Confession of his Schism.*

THE Doctor having laid his tottering grounds for the Kings Supremacy in Ecclesiastical affairs, by alleadging some Testimonies expresly against himself and his cause, and not one expresly for them, but what his fellow-schismaticks afforded him. Next having supposed upon his own strongly-dreaming imagination, without one direct place of any Authentick writer, against clouds of most plain Testimonies from Fathers and Councils, frequent in our Controversies, and not touched by him in way of answer; against the most visible practice and universal belief of the whole *Catholick world*; that the *Pope* is onely a private *Patriarch* and hath no right of Jurisdiction over the universal Church. And lastly, out of a few Testimonies witnessing *de facto*, that Kings did *erect and remove Patriarchates*, without any word excluding the Churches precedent orders, having concluded that such a power belonged *de jure* to Kings, and was annext to a Crown: These three things, most gravely supposed, he goes about to clear the Church of *England* from the imputation of casting off obedience to the Bishop of *Rome* at the Reformation; which is the intent of this Chapter.

But

But first he lays down at large the whole history of *Schism* (committing onely the main things that might disgrace it) and by what degrees or steps this miserable Kingdom and Church came to renounce the obedience to those Ecclesiastical superiors, who had (by their own confession, for eight or nine hundred years) steered that then-secure Barque in a calm unity of Faith; and which Authority all the then present world, except *King Henry's* now friend, but late Antagonist *Luther*, acknowledged and submitted to: First he tells us this was done by *the Clergy in a Synod, recognizing the King to be supreme Head of the Church of England*; Secondly, *By their submitting themselves to the King*; and thirdly, *the definition of the Universities and Monasteries after debate, that the Pope had nothing to do more in* England *then any other extern Bishop*; that is, nothing at all: And all this in this sort *concluded, subscribed and confirmed by their corporal oaths*, (which word *corporal* was well put in, for their Souls and Consciences never went along with it) was afterwards turn'd into Acts of Parliament, in which it was *resolved upon the question* to defie the Pope and all his works. C. 7. S. 2, 3, 4.

In answer to which (though a bare narration how a *Schism* was made, deserve none) yet to devoid it of al excuse it may pretend to, I object, first, that it did not originally spring from Conscience, no not even an erroneous one, but from manifest malice and viciousness. Next that the Kingdoms assent to this il originiz'd breach was not free: And thirdly, that though both these were granted, yet this act of theirs, so largely

laid out by Doctor *Hammond*, is truly and properly a *Schism*, and entitles them *schismaticks*; nay the more the Doctor dilates upon it, the more *schismatical* he makes the breach, of which the two latter himself though never so loath must acknowledge, unless he will deny his own words.

To begin with the first, all the world knows that, till King *Henry* violenced the breach, all *England* both Clergy and Laity were as equally and as peaceably conjoyned to the Catholike Church under the government of her supreme Pastour, the Bishop of *Rome*, as either *France* or *Spain* are now: neither did they ever express any scrupulosity that they had remained under such a Government ever since the Conversion of their first Fore-fathers; nor were scandalized at the then received Doctrine of the Church, holding as a point of Faith that the Pope was its Head, but abominated the contrary as sacrilegious and *schismatical*. The first urger of the breach then was the King (as is also acknowledged) let us see then what or who urg'd him, that so we may trace the *schism* to its first original, and shew the new-born brat its right Parent.

As for the King, while his blood was yet in due temper and not over-heated with passion, that is, while his Conscience was uncorrupted, it is well known he was as humble a son to the Church and her supreme Pastour, the *Bishop of Rome*, as any King in Christendom is at this present; admitting appeals thither, and his jurisdiction here; nay, indeed more officiously obedient then any King now-adays can pre-

tend,

tend; writing (or else causing to be set out in his name) a Book against *Luther* in defence of the Roman-Catholick Faith and the Popes Authority which that Apostate rejected; for which work also he received in recompence from the Pope the title of *Defender of the Faith*, inherited by the succeeding Kings, though they have forfeited the claim to it by disavowing the fact which deserved it.

What was King *Henries* judgment of the Popes Universal Authority till he fell into passion, is easie to be seen in his own Book, where he strongly and rationally proves it in these words. *Henricus* in Assert. 7. Sacram. contra *Luth.* Art. 2.

Negare Lutherus *non potest, quin omnis Ecclesia fidelium Sacro-Sanctam sedem* Romanam *velut Matrem Primatemque recognoscat ac veneretur, quacunque saltem neque locorum distantiâ neque periculis interjacentibus prohibetur accessu. Quamquam, si vera dicunt qui ex India quoque veniunt huc, Indi etiam ipsi tot terrarum, tot marium, tot solitudinum plagis disjuncti,* Romano *tamen Pontifici se submittunt. Ergo, si tantam & tam latè fusam potestatem neque Dei jussu Pontifex, neque hominum voluntate consecutus est, sed quâ sibi ut vendicavit, dicat velim* Lutherus, *quando in tantæ ditionis erupit professionem? Num potest obscurum esse initium tam immensæ potentiæ, præsertim si intra hominum memoriam nata sit? Quod si rem dixerit unam fortasse aut duas ætates superare; in memoriam vobis redigat ex Historiis: Alioqui si tam vetusta sit, ut rei etiam tantæ obliterata sit origo. Legibus omnino cautum esse cognoscat, ut cujus jam omnium hominum memoriam ita supergreditur, ut sciri non possit cujusmodi habuerit initium,*

rum, censeatur habuisse legitimum: Petitumque esse constat omnium consensu Gentium ne quæ diu manserunt immota moveantur.

Luther cannot deny, but all the Church of the faithful, acknowledges and venerates the See of Rome as their Mother and Chief: at least whatsoever Church is not hindred from coming thither by distance of place or dangers in the way. Although if credit may be given to those who come from the Indies, even the very Indians separated by such vast Lands, Seas, and Wildernesses, submit themselves to the Bishop of Rome. ——— Wherefore if the Pope hath obtained so great and far-spread an Authority neither by the command of God, nor the will of men, but hath arrogated it to himself by some violence, I would know of Luther, when and at what time the Pope broke forth into the profession of so ample a Jurisdiction? Can the beginning of such a vast power be obscure? Especially, if it were born within the memory of man. But if he shall say this power exceeds one or two ages, let him bring it into our memory by histories. Otherwise, if it be so ancient that the original of it matter, even of so great importance, be worn out of memory, then let him know it is expressly provided for by the Laws, that his right and title which so transcends all memory of man as it cannot be known how it began, is judged to have had a lawful original; and it is manifest that the consent of all Nations forbid those things should be moved which have long remained setled and firm.

Thus was King Henry affected, and in this affection continued till he found an itching (I conceive not too conscientious) to his darling

ling *Anne Bullen*; she being too crafty to forgoe the glittering offer of a Crown made unto her by the love-besotted King; he grew straight perplext in minde for his former marriage; began to think it unlawful, though till now neither he nor any in the world ever scrupled it. The devotion he bore to his Saint *Anne Bullen* put a new heat of Religion into his tender heart; his restless Conscience (alas) perswaded him that his marriage with *Katherine*, although confirmed by two and twenty yeers continuance, and sealed with the endearing pledge of issue, must needs be disanuld.

The Pope was urged to dispence with his second marriage, though his former wife lived: King *Henry* wooed, intreated, bribed; then grew into choller, and at last plainly threatned a *Schisme*, unless the Pope would grant and justifie his unlawful desire.

Here now if the *Romish Religion* were made up onely of Policy (as those think whose eys her prudent and heaven-ordered Government dazles into a blind envy of her priviledges) the Pope should rather have sought pretences to yeeld to this unwarrantable request, then have denyed it with the loss of a Kingdom from his Jurisdiction; but the common Father of the Church more considered (unless we will give way to the suspicious Reports of enemies) what detriment and scandal to the whole world was likely to result from such an impious example in so

eminent a person; then consulted with flesh and blood how to second his desire or cloak his grant with the outside of a dangerous necessity.

He first counselled friendly, then reprehended him Fatherly, at last refused his consent absolutely: Upon this King *Henry* grew furious, put away his most pious and vertuous Lady Queen *Katherine*, whose Angelical Sanctity and Dove-like patience he always continued to honour, when as he beheaded her assumed Rival. Her disenthronement was *Anna Bullens* enstalment: The marriage was celebrated with a divorce of our poor Country from the Church: Appeals to *Rome*, denied under pain of death.

The *Popes* Authority, which had remained inviolable, ever since we English were by its means converted, utterly rejected; nay, the very name of *Pope* rased out of all the Books in *England*; Monasteries and Religious Houses pulled down or robbed, their Revenues (given by their devout Founders to pious uses) confiscate and consecrated to the Kings riotous Lust. Subscriptions forced to a new, and till that time unheard of, Church-Government, a Secular Head of an Ecclesiastical Body; they that would not subscribe, disgraced or put to death.

Thus the Reformation was first set on foot, and this lust of King *Henry* was so fruitful, that at once begot Tyranny, Rapine, the Reformation, Adultery. Protestancy, at least the embrio of it, Sacriledge, Queen *Elizabeth*, and

Schism. And, though the Doctor excuses the imputation of King *Henries* Sacriledge, saying, That Sacriledge is no more Schism, then it is Adultery; yet it is enough, if he grant (as he must) That both his Sacriledge and his Schism, were born of the same mother-occasion, the Kings lust; and so, though the Doctor say, That C. 7. S. 20.

——— *facies non omnibus una,*

Yet I answer,

Nec diversa tamen, qualem decet esse sororum:

——— their faces not the same;
Nor different yet, as sisters well became.

Neither is this all to shew, that the first occasion of the breach, was not Conscience. The King himself desired oftentimes afterwards a reconcilement; which being not possible, without revoking all he had done, despair made him resolve, *Over shooes, over boots,* to make the rupture still wider, while he lived; though at his death, when it was no time to dally, the care of his Soul now out-weighing the pleasure of his Body, he with extream grief of heart repented him of his *Schism.*

By this, one may see, how justly the Doctor pretended, *Pag.* 18, 19. as an excuse of his *Schism, The care of their Conscience, and the not admitting any sin,* which the Church may oblige them *to subscribe to*; whereas, if the original of the breach be this (as it most evidently is) then I cannot conceive the Church obliged the ringleader of it to any sin in bidding him keep his own wife. But if you pretend another, which

which by the whole scope of this Chapter, you seem not to do, it will be found to have no nobler an extraction, then the former; onely perhaps, the carnal sin in him, may be changed into a spiritual one in you; that is, King *Henries* lust, into your self-conceited pride, and refractory disobedience; which may indeed out-vy and excel him, though not excuse you.

But perhaps your grounds, which before absolved the Rebel, Out-law, and Anabaptist, will absolve him too, by laying it was *King* Henries *present perswasion*, that his wife was to be put away; and then comes in the whole eighth Paragraph of the second Chapter, to plead for the adulterous King, thus; *Nay, though the error be really on his side, yet if the doctrines so proposed* (that he ought to keep his wife) *as the condition of Communion be indeed agreeable to truth, but yet be really apprehended by him, to whom they are thus proposed, to be false, and disagreeable; it will even in that case be hard to affirm, That that man may lawfully subscribe* (or K. *Henry* lawfully keep his wife) *contrary to his present perswasion.*

Thus much for the first thing I undertook to shew, that the original of this breach proceeded not from Conscience; the second will also appear no less manifest, *That the progress and promoting* of it, was altogether as unconscientious.

The second consideration, which renders this Schism more inexcusable in the now Protestants, is, That when it first was brought into this

this Kingdom, it was no free choice of the Ecclesiastical State; which, could the Doctor prove, he would think it perhaps, of some weight: The King using all means, both by perswasions and force, to make men subscribe; persecuting continually those that refused, and putting to death many upon the same score; among the rest, those two Lights of our Nation for learning and piety, Bishop *Fisher*, and Sir *Thomas Moor*, most intimate with the King, and in the sincerest loyalty addicted to him, till their knowing conscientiousness made them refuse to subscribe, lest they might at once prejudice Loyalty and Religion by a prepostrous obedience.

But what need more proofs, since the Doctor grants here, Section five, *That it is easie to believe that nothing but the apprehension of dangers, which hung over them (by a Præmunire incurred by them) could probably have inclined the Clergy to subscribe*, thus he: Though, blowing and supping both at once, he straight-way addes, *That the Reasons or Arguments offered in debate, were the causes (as in all charity we are to judge) of their decision.* Whereas I cannot see any reason, why the Doctor should be so uncharitably charitable, as to judge them not onely weak, but so to have been hardned, and lost for the future all feeling of Conscience for their lapse; since the fore-going fear bears the weight of a strong prejudice against the clear Verdict of Conscience, and the future recantation of all the Bishops (who then subscribed) in Queen *Maries* time, and their persisting in Queen *Elizabeths* days, rather evidences, That the curb being removed, which

misled

misled them, it was Conscience which made them return; and strength and force of Conscience which made them afterwards persevere in the same judgment.

The third thing I am to prove; and make the Doctor confess, is, That there was a breach made, which denominates them truly and properly Schismaticks. The first part is so clear, that it needs no proof, since *the very deed bears witness.* For first, your self acknowledge, *you renounced the Authority of the* Roman *See, and cast it out of this Iland.* Which Authority yet you must acknowledge likewise, That all the whole World, which before the breach you held the onely good Christians, submitted to as sacred, and descended from *Christs* institution; which Authority was known and held, both by them, and your selves, till then, to be over both you and your King, in Ecclesiastical matters; and had enjoyed the possession of that Claim, confessedly eight or nine hundred years; nor this upon title onely of a Patriarchate, your Conversion, or Grant of Kings, but of an Universal Primacy and Pastorship over the whole Church by *Christs* grant, and before your conversion was dream'd on.

C. 7. S. 5.

Lastly, The Government of the Church thus established, was held by all those whom before that day you accounted the onely Faithful, as of Divine Right, and a point of Faith; and that the denial of it, twisted into one crime, both *Heresie* and *Schism.*

A manifest breach then, and *Schism* there was made

made by you; first, from that supreme Ecclesiastical Governor, under whom, both you and your Ancestors, till that time, had ever-continued, and next, from the Universality of Christians; by erecting to your selves a new structure of *Church-Government*, which all the vast Congregation of these, from whom you broke, detested and abhorred as Sacrilegious and *Schismatical*. Singularity therefore most clearly manifested it self in your new *Church-Government*; and if singularity be opposite to a community, of which, Communion is the Form, it follows evidently, That your singularity destroyed Communion, and so was formally *Schism*. Again, if multitudes of things of the same *species* cannot be made *one*, otherwise then by the *unity* of *order*, it follows, That what dissolves this *order*, dissolves the *unity*, and so causes a breach or *Schism*. But you manifestly unravelled all the then constituted *order* of Gods Church, by casting out of the Kingdom, the supreme Authority, in which, as in a knot, the other several ends were sum'd and tied up; therefore you also unravelled and broke asunder its *unity*.

This then, as it is acknowledged by you, so in it self, is as clear, as the most palpable matter of Fact can make a thing visible to the eyes of the World, that there was indeed, at least, a material breach or *Schism*, by you made, from that Body which communicated with the Church of *Rome*; and of which Body, you were formerly as properly and truly a part, as a Branch is of a Tree. To which adde your proofs out of the Fathers, in your first Chapter, af-

firming,

firming, *No just cause can be given for a Schism*; and it will follow, that your own words clearly convince, and your own proofs evidently conclude you to be formally *Schismaticks*. I will put the Argument in form, to make it more plain, onely premising, That material Schism, as far as it concerns us, at present, is the extern action of breaking from a community: Formal, the causlesness or unjustifiableness of that material Fact; which must needs be criminal, because it admits no just excuse to plead in its behalf. Then thus,

No Separation from the whole Body of Christians can possibly be justified, say the Fathers, by you alleaged, *Chap. 2. Sect. 8.*

But your Separation was from the whole Body of Christians: Therefore impossible to be justified.

Where all the evasion I can imagin in your behalf, is to distinguish the *Major*, That the Fathers meant, *Criminal Separation*, or the *Crime* of *Schism* could have no *just cause given for it*, not the material and external *fact* of *Schism*.

But first, this makes the Fathers very shallow, to go about to shew, That no just cause can be alleaged for the crime of *Schism*, since every one knows there can be no just excuse possible for any crime.

Next, the Fathers there alleaged, pretend to particularize some special viciousness in

Schism

Schism, and are to that end produced by the Doctor: But there is no speciality in *Schism* above other sins, to say, *That no just excuse can be given for the crime of it*, since the like may be said of all sins, as well as it. *The fact of Schism* therefore it is which they call *unjustifiable*; the same fact, which with a large narration you here set down, and acknowledge, that they *said it*, *voted it*, *swore it*; taking a great deal of pains, to prove those whom you undertook to defend, to be voluntary, deliberate, and *sworn Schismaticks*.

Now all the Testimonies alleaged by your self against *Schism*, come in troops, bandying against you, and your cause, as strongly, as if they had been expresly gathered to that purpose. As, that a *Schismatick* is *à semet-ipso damnatus*, *self-condemned*; which you have here very learnedly performed, as I lately shewed, That *ultrò ex Ecclesiâ se ejicerent*, *they cast themselves voluntarily out of the Church*, &c. *Quomodo te à tot gregibus scidisti? Excidisti enim teipsum. How hast thou cut off thy self from so many flocks? For thy self hast cut off thy self*, of which accusation, your fifth Paragraph infers the confession: Your own voluntary recession from us, and our Government, by your self here acknowledged, is an indelible token, and (as it were) a visible ear-mark, that you are a stray-sheep, and a run-away, *à tot gregibus*, from the *flock*. C. 7. S. 6.

This

This badg of a *Voluntary Recession*, your Church must always necessarily carry about her: Nor will you ever be able to wipe it off with all the specious *Id Est's*, or Criticisms, your wit can invent.

Sect:

SECT. 9.

The nature of Schism fetch't from it's first grounds; and the material part of it fastened upon the Protestants.

TO lay this charge of Schisme yet more home to the Protestants, we will open more clearly the nature of Schism, and describe it more exactly, that the Reader may see how perfectly the Protestant Church is cast in the mold of it. For the better conceiving of which, it will be necessary to shew first what it is, which makes the Sons of the Catholike Church like brethren live together in Unity: and this will lead us into the consideration first of the *formal Unity* it self, and secondly of the *Reason and Ground of this Unity.*

The *Unity it selfe* consists in two things; one is, the submitting to and communicating in one common Head or Government; the Authority of which, if it be establish't in an undoubted possession (as it was at the beginning of Mr. *Drs* Reformation) is as necessary to the *Ecclesiastical* Community, as the acknowledgement of the Undoubted Supreme Magistrate is necessary for the Unity of any temporal Common-wealth. The second is the communication of the member-churches with one another, consisting in the acknowledging the same Articles of Faith, and using the same Sacraments &c. To these was

added anciently communicatory letters; which afterwards, by reason of the perfect colligation of the several members with their *Head*, was neglected as unnecessary.

And these two Unities may be conceived again either negatively or positively. By negative Communion in the same Head, I mean a not disacknowledging only of the supreme Pastor; or at least such an indifferent acknowledgment, as having no tie upon it, may be at pleasure refused; and the Authority rejected. As likewise *negative communication* between the member-Churches imports either a sleight not denying of communion, or such an acceptance and embracing of it, as, having no obligation, may at pleasure be turned into disacceptance and disavowing.

On the contrary; these two communications are then called *positive*, when there is a *positive* obligation to acknowledge that *Head*, and communicate with the other Churches. And this is that which can only make a Church, and found Church-government: Or rather indeed there can be no Government imaginable, either spiritual or corporal, without such positive communion, for a company of men without an expresse and positive obligation to obey their Superiors, and comport themselves towards their fellows, according to the laws, may indeed be called a multitude (such as is *acervus lapidum*, an heap of stones) but not an *Army*, *City*, *Commonwealth* or *Church*, which imply connexion and *order*.

Neither is the obligation of only Charity sufficient (though in it selfe a great Cement of Unity) but it must be a visible one, resulting

out

out of the very Nature of Government, which is visible and exterior. Besides, Charity extends universally to all, even those out of the Church; and therfore cannot be that proper, peculiar and sole tie, which unites the Faithfull, as they are a Common-wealth of Beleevers.

The second thing is the *Reason* of this double *Union*, or rather of this double *positive obligation of Unity* in the Church; which to conceive more clearly, the Reader may please to consider, that a Christian is a Christian by his Faith; and so a Congregation of Christians is a Community of the Faithfull. Whence it followes, that the Unity of the Faithfull, as such, being in Faith, their faith must be one; the ground therefore of the Unity of their faith is the ground of the Unity of the faithfull; but the infallibity of the Church is the ground of the Unity of faith: Therefore the same Infallibility is the reason of the Unity or *positive* Communion of the Faithful. This Rule therefore, broken or rejected, dissolves all positive Communion amongst Christians, both in *Faith* and *Sacraments*. For what tie could they possibly have to communicate in any thing consequent to Faith, as Sacraments, Government, or any good work, unless they first communicate in faith, the rule and ground of those Sacraments, Government, and good works; and how can they communicate in faith, if there be no Infallibility to binde them to an *Unity* in it? The denying therefore of this Infallibility is the reason of all *Schism*, and even of *Heresie* too; nay, it selfe is the Heresie of Heresies, opening a liberty for every man to embrace his owne

new-fangled opinions and introducing principles of incertitude, and at best probability in Religion, whose natural course is to wander at last into a Civil kind of Atheism. Nor can there be any rational pretence to oblige mens consciences to a Religion, whose confest uncertainty must needs infer an absolute abolishment of all Church-discipline, and content it selfe with a meer voluntary obedience, that is, legitimate all *Schism*, by taking away the very possibibility of *Schismatizing*.

Another reason may be given, why the denying this *infallibility* perverts & quite overthrows all *unity* in Church-government. For the preservation of the Churches unity in government being essential to Religion, that is, to the Art of breeding up mankind to know and love God, it cannot possibly be conceived to be of humane but divine institution; and therefore, being taught and instituted by *Christ*, belongs to Faith, and so requires to be recommended by the same never-erring Rule, which teaches us the rest of his Doctrine. He therefore that denies this Infallibility, hath no sufficient reason to *beleeve* the Article of the Churches Government, and consequently will easily finde evasion to excuse his obedience to her commands.

The *Unity* of the Church being thus clearly delivered, there needs no new task to shew what *Schism* is; it being nothing else but the unknitting and dissolving these several manners of this *Unity* and *Communion*, and in breaking asunder that tye and *obligation*, by which these *Unions* of the several *members* with one another, and of all with the *Head*, are firm'd

and

and made inviolable. What remaines to be done is onely to shew that this *Anatomy* of *Schism* is the perfect picture, nay the very *Sceleton* of the carkasse-Church of *England*; and that they have infring'd the lawes of Unity in all the aforesaid manners.

And as for the first, which is the *Unity* of all the *Members* under one *Head* or Chief Bishop and Pastour of the Church, in whom, at the time of the breach, all the Hierarchical Order was summed up, as in the highest top of that Heaven-reaching *Climax*, you confesse here *Sect.* 5. that *you cast it out of this Island.* The Authority, I say, of the chief Pastourship of the *Bishop of Rome*, to which you and the whole Church you were then in, were subject; acknowledged by you not Patriarchal onely, but a large step higher, to wit, universally extended over all *Patriarchs* and the whole Church, was that which you cast out, and subtracted your selfe from its obedience. If then you will hold to your former grounds, so largely to your disadvantage laid in your third Chapter, that it is *Schism* in a *Deacon* or *Priest* to disobey a *Bishop*, in a *Bishop* to refuse subjection to his *Arch-Bishop* &c. How will you excuse your selves from *Schism* in rejecting the Authority of the *Head* of the Church (unless you can evidence that Authority null; that is, that Doctrine false) to which you had been subject ever since your first Conversion, as to a more superiour Governour than either *Bishop*, *Arch-Bishop*, *Primate* or *Patriarch*. In vaine then was your long frivolous digression, that Kings may erect and translate *Patriarchates*, since a greater Authority than a *Patriarch* was

rejected by you and *cast out of this Island*; which no King ever pretended to erect and remove at pleasure. In vain do you think to shelter your Schism under the wings of the Regal power; since your King, being at that time actually under the Pope, as far as concerned *Ecclesiastical* matters, and acknowledging his supreme Pastourship, lies himself as deeply obnoxious to the charge of *Schism*, as you his subjects and followers; or rather much more, as being the Ringleader of the breach. So as no plea is so unwarrantable as to bring him for your excuse, who is the person accounted most guilty, and who needs a plea himself for his own far more inexcusable *Schism* and disobedience. But what excuse you bring or not bring concerns us not at present; onely this remains certain and acknowledg'd, that you cast out of the Island that Supreme Authority, in which at that time, the Faithful of the Church you were in, communicated; and in which chiefly consisted the Unity of the Hierarchical Government, arising orderly and knit up peaceably in acknowledgment of and subjection to that *One Head*. Whether you did this justly or no belongs to the formal part of *Schism*, and shall be discussed in the following Section.

Next, for what concerns the *Unity* of one Member-Church with another, it is no lesse evident you have broke asunder all *positive Communion*, not in Government onely (as hath been shewn) but in *Faith* and *Sacraments* with all *Churches* which communicated with the *See of Rome*, whom, before your Schism, you held the onely and sole true *Members* of

Christs mystical Body. That you broke from their *Communion in Government* hath been already manifested from your rejecting her *Supreme Governour*, in the subjection to whom they all communicated. Nor is it less evident that you have broke from their *Faith*, as appeares from the irreconcileable diversity of the points of Faith between us, and the large difference between your 39. *Articles*, and our *Council* of *Trent*. Nor has the Unity you and those Churches had in Sacraments escaped better; Five of them being par'd away as unnecessary; the sixth transelementated from the sacred price of our Redemption into the *egena elementa* of bread and wine: and the seventh onely, that is, *Baptism*, with much adoe remaining inviolate, lest you should forfeit the name of Christians also, together with the reality. If the denial of these, and your styling the best act of our Religion, to wit, the *the oblation of the Unbloody Sacrifice* (in your 31. Article) *a blasphemous fiction and pernicious imposture*; and lastly, if your persecuting us to death be signes of *a positive communion* with us; then killing may be called kindness, and *railing votes against us*, may perhaps be styled *Communicatory letters with us*.

All Communication then both *positive* and *negative*, with the Church you were in formerly, was by you renounced; yet at least some pretence of excuse had been producible, if, departing out of that Church, you had either kept or renew'd *Communion* with some other, which was acknowledged by all the World, or at least by your selves before the breach to have been a true one. But you can pretend no such

thing as *Communication* with any Church either true or even false. For first at your dawning or rather twilight in King *Henry*'s dayes (for your progress hath not been to noon-day-light, but to midnight) you had nothing at all to doe with any other Church in Christendom. Since that time, though you have indeed a kinde of Communication with some few of your fellow Schismaticks, yet, if well examin'd, it is *negative* onely. Faction against *Rome* initiates you into so much friendship as to converse with the *Calvinists*; sometimes to call them Brethren; sometimes to be merry with your double-jug Companions in the *Synod* of *Dort*, of whose drunken and beastly behaviour, wallowing worse then swine, in their own vomits, I have heard a Pillar of your own Church scandalously complain, having too much spirit of draff forced by them into his queasier stomach. Though, I say, you may thus communicate with them in eating and drinking (in which acts* before you made *All Communion* consist) yet any other *positive* tie and obligation either with them or any others to conserve you in *Communion*, so as you may be said to make up one Ecclesiastically-politick Body, united by some inviolable Order, such an obligation, I say, could never be discover'd between you and any other Church good or bad, true or false. The Greek Church holding almost all that we doe, and scarce two points with you, which are against us, as your friend *Alexander Rosse* hath particularly told you. The *Lutherans* hold much more with us in opposition to you, than with you in opposition to us. The *Calvinists* are excluded by the most understanding Protestants

Part. 1. Sect. 19.

Protestants from their Church, since they admit not the Government of *Bishops*, held by the others to be of *Divine Right*, nor the *Protestants* Fundamental, or, as the Doctor calls it, *The Bottome of the Foundation of the Reformation*; to wit, that the King is *Head* of the Church. The 39. Articles, which (as the Kings *Supremacy* is the *Imprimis*, so these) are all the *Items* of the *Protestants* Faith, obtain not a total admission from any Church but themselves; nor amongst themselves neither, their great Champion, Mr. *Chillingworth*, rejecting them at his pleasure. Nor is there any visible form of Government uniting them all together, but they are forced to fly senceless to an invisible one; either of onely *Christ* in Heaven, or onely *Charity*: pretences to gull the easie vulgar, not to satisfie prudent men; who know that the Church, though it be a spiritual Common-wealth, breeding up Soules to a state of a future Eternity; yet, while it is here on earth, it is a *Common-wealth* of *Christians*, visibly comporting or discomporting themselves in order to *Christs* laws, of which the Church is the Keeper and Conserver; and therefore it must have visible Governours, without expecting a miraculous recourse to *Christ* in Heaven, to resolve emergent difficulties, or to cherish and punish her well-demeaned or mildemeaned subjects. Cap. 7. Sect. 11.

But for a more full demonstration that the Church of *England* has no perfect Communion with the *Greek*, *Lutheran*, *Calvinist*, or any other Church, I refer the Reader to the learned *Exomologesis* or Motives &c. of Mr. *Cressy*, a late Protestant Dean, but now Religious of the ancient and holy Order of *St. Benet*, where the Doctor

Doctor may also read (among other controversies excellently treated) the charge of Schism, sufficiently prov'd against his Church.

Perhaps the Doctor will alledge, that their *positive Communion* with other reformed Churches consists in the acknowledgment of *Gods Word* and the holding to it. But I would ask him, whether he means they agree in the *Name* of Gods Word, or in the Thing, or *Sence* of it. If in the *Name* onely, then all that have the title of *Christians*, that is, all *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* in the World are of one Communion; nothing being more rife in their mouths and pens, than wrong alledged testimonies out of the Bible; the bare *name* then is not sufficient, it must be the *Thing*, that is, the *sence and meaning of Gods Word*, in which he must make their *positive Communion* consist; but since they have no one certain, known, and commonly acknowledged Rule, by which to interpret Gods word, and fetch out the true inward sence, lurking in the imperspicuous bark of the letter, it followes they have no *positive way* or meanes to communicate in the same sence, and therefore no *positive unity* can be grounded on that pretence. And it would be as senceless to object that they communicate at least in fundamentals, found in *Gods word*; since the *Scripture* not telling them, they cannot tell certainly themselves which points are *fundamentals*, which not, all being there with equal authority and like tenour delivered and proposed to them. And if we should goe to reason to know what are *fundamentals*, surely reason would give it that the rules of Faith and Government are more *fundamental*, than all the rest.

N

No *positive communion* therefore have they with our Church, as little with their *fellow schismaticks*; it being the nature of boughs separated, not to grow together into one tree, after they have once lost connection with the root; Where they are cut off, there they lie; and though for a short time they retain some verdure, and some little moysning sap, counterfeiting life; that is, as much Religion as serves them to talk of *God* and *Christ*) yet after a while they wither, rot, and molder away into an hundred atomes of dust; or else (if they chance to be gathered up, or taken away sooner) they serve for nothing but to be thrown into the fire.

SECT. 10.

That the reforming Protestants were and are guilty of the formal part of Schism.

THat you have made then a *material breach* or *schism*, as as evident, as fact and reason can make the most manifest thing to the clearest understanding. The *formality of schism* comes next to be enquired into, which consists in its *injustifiableness*, or doing it without *just causes or motives*; which consequently, unless you can shew, you must unavoidably be concluded *formal schismaticks*; And though the testimonies of the Fathers, which you formerly produced, affirming that there can be no just cause given of *schism*, render all further proof unnecessary; yet

to

to make this matter stil more manifest, I desire Mr. *Hammond*, in the Churches behalfe, that he would give me leave to summon him to the Bar of Reason, that we may see what he can answer for himselfe, and his friends, whose *defence* here he undertakes.

Cath. Do not you know that the Church (in whose bowels your ancestors, til K. *Henry* began the breach, were bred) had no other form of Government then that which now is of the Bishop of *Rome*; held chiefe Pastour of the universal Church, and supreme in Ecclesiastical matters; and that, til the breach was made, you held as sacred, and were under that government?

Dr. I pretend not to deny it; for this is the very authority I told you in my 7. c. 5. *sect. we cast out of this Island.* Besides Kings can erect and remove *Patriarchates* at pleasure.

Cath. Do not answer, (Dr.) *de Cepis*, when we ask *de aliis*; you might have sav'd your labour in a great part of your Book, wher you slipt the question, and digrest to *Patriarchs*. Our question is not of *Patriarchal*, but of *Papal* Authority; and so we ask you, whether it be not evident, that this *Papal Authority* was in actual possession of this Islands subjection at the time of the breach; and so had been for 900 yeers, ever since Pope *Gregory* sent *Austin* the Monk to convert the *Saxons*, forefathers to us English.

Dr. I know no Authority he ever had in *England* more than *Patriarchal*.

Cath. Do not you know that the Popes Authority then acknowledged in *England* was held above *Patriarchs*, and therefore more then *Patriarchal*; and that you grant you cast out of this

this Island, not a *Patriarchal* Authority only, but a *Papal* one?

Dr. True; but the pretended Authority was usurpt, and not according to Gods Ordinance.

Cath. How know you it was usurpt? wil *bare probabilities* be a sufficient ground to renounce an authority so long establisht in possession, held sacred ever before, and to which your selves were till then subject; wil, I say, a meer probability, that *perhaps* that authority was not sacred, but unjust, serve your turn to excuse you from disobedience in renouncing it?

Dr. No Sir, we have *evidence* it was *unjust*; and that the Church we were brought up in erred in that point of belief.

Cath. This evidence of yours must either be a Demonstration from natural reason; or an undeniable testimony, either divine or humane.

Dr. I doe not pretend natural demonstration; but we have evident testimonies against it.

Cath. Can you manifest that those testimonies (and the like may be said of Arguments from natural reason) have not been answer'd twenty times over by our Writers; and (in case they have) can you shew that you have replied upon all their answers, so as they bear now no probable shew of satisfaction? if not, you cannot call your testimony an *evidence*. Next, are you certain that our Authors cannot produce an hundred testimonies for one of yours; or at least an equal number; and those seeming as expressly, or more, to make for us, as yours doe for you? If so, your testimonies are at least counterpois'd with the weight of

ours

ours, and so cannot make an *evidence*, but hang only in the hovering scales of a *doubtfull probability*. Thirdly, are your testimonies such that they are of greater weight than the judgment of all the Catholick world, holding the Pope Head of the Church (as our greatest adversaries, the Puritans, say for twelve hundred years, or, as you say, two hundred years later) are they of that weight to over-ballance so far-extended, so numerous, and so learned an Authority? If not, they are so far from *evidences*, that they fall short of being *probabilities*.

Dr. I see you will hold to no authority, but that of your own Church, and *this is a method of security beyond all Amulets.*

Cath. And good reason too, unless yon can shew us a greater.

Dr. A greater we have, *id est*, Gods word, out of which we can evidence, that your Church, we were brought up in, was *fallible*, yea err'd in many points, and particularly in this of the *Popes Supremacy*.

Cath. You cannot with any face pretend an evidence from Scripture against us, unless you can evidence a greater faculty and meanes to interpret those Oracles in you or your first Reformers, than there was in the Church you left: And since these meanes are either *supernatural light* or *natural parts and knowledge*, you must evidence an advantage above us in one of these. And first, as for *natural knowledg*, you cannot be ignorant, that at the time of the breach, the *Catholick* Church had an hundred Doctors for one of yours; what an unproportion'd advantage then must that number swel to, if all the learned

learned men in the many foregoing ages, without any one of your Sect (then unheard of) to counterballance them, be heaped into one Bulk, and those too, such as your selves must acknowledge far more eminent in Schoole Divinity, study in Scripture, and all kinde of Learning both divine and humane, than any of *King Henry*'s fellow-reformers were ever deemed; or if you stiffely deny an advantage, we as stiffely pretend it; and so leave it a drawn match for what concernes their parts; yet you your selves must grant, you are incomparably overpower'd in the numerous multitude of them.

In natural meanes then of interpreting Scripture, our extraordinary advantage over your Reformers, makes it an impudence in them to pretend their advantage *evident*. It must be then an evidence of a *supernatural faculty* in interpreting Gods word, better than their Superiours and Pastors, which can make them pretend to a clear knowledge thence that our Church hath err'd: But since no supernatural thing, that is latent and invisible in it selfe, can be evidenced or acknowledged to be such, without some exteriour token exceeding the power and skill of nature, as are *miracles, gift of tongues*, &c. none of which you can lay claim to; it followes, that neither your reforming forefathers nor your selves can produce evidence of any better meanes, either *supernatural* or *natural* to interpret Scriptures than the Church you left; therefore no evidence that they more truely interpreted it than that Church; therfore none thence that the Church err'd; therefore none from divine Authority,

and

and no humane authority being found comparable to that of the Church, it followes they can have as little evidence from thence. *Evident* therefore it is that you neither had nor now have any *evidence* at all, but onely a *probable perhaps*, that the Church erred; which being too sleight a Reason to shake off subjection to an authority so long establish't and held as a point of Faith by the present and past world, consequently they who upon no better grounds should shake it off, are guilty of a most rash and grievous disobedience, and *Schism*. But your selfe here confesse *Sect.* 5. that you cast this Authority out of this Island, without power to evidence that that *Church* erred, as hath been shewn. What excuse then can you alledge to clear your Father-Reformers, and your selfe from a most irrational, and *selfe-condemning Schism*, nay more, *heresie*?

Dr. At least they had such proofes as they thought *evident*, and bred in them a *present perswasion* that the Church hath erred, which they could not in conscience goe against; and therefore it was hard dealing to *punish them* with *Excommunication* for *proceeding conscientiously according to their present perswasion*.

Cath. I doubt not but they might have a *present perswasion* that the Church hath err'd; but I doubt much whether this present perswasion be sufficient to excuse them either from sin or punishment. For this *perswasion* of theirs is either *rational* or *irrational*; if *rational*, a sufficient reason may be render'd why they deny'd so *qualified* a Government; and reason it selfe telling us that no reason less than *evidence* is sufficient, it would follow that *evidence* may

be

be rendred that the Government was injust? which, as you see, could not: *Irrational* therefore was that *present perswasion* of theirs; and if so, not sprung from *reason*, therefore from *unreasonable passion*, that is, from *vice*, therefore sinful and obnoxious to punishment, as all other like *perswasions* are, which make men think and act against their duties and obligations; Besides, all the Logick we have hitherto heard, assures us nothing can convince the understanding but *evidence*, and therefore men take so much paines about the *moods* and *figures*, that the discourse may prove *evident*; wherefore whatsoever assent comes not out of *Evidence*, must come from our *will* and *wilfulnesse*; and by consequence cannot be free from desert of punishment, if it happen to be *wrong* and *wrongfull*. Neither availes it to pretend *invincible ignorance*, since no man living, if free from a proud spirit, can be so sottish as not to know that it is his obligation to obey his Superiors so long setled in the possession of their command, till most open and undeniable *Evidences*, and not seeming ones onely, should discover that Authority null. And, if the obligation be of belief, he must condemn the Churches judgment in not seeing the falsity of her doctrine, and prefer his own before millions more learned, who liv'd and dy'd in that faith, which savours too strong of a self-conceited pride; or else imagin so little sincerity left in the Church, that all see and wilfully adhere to a known falshood, but himselfe; which is a plain sign of a rash and Pharisaical presumption. And are not those punishable? yet the Doctor would stroke such a fellow on

the head, and give him sugar plums for *following his present perswasion* and self-conceit, which he nicknames *conscience*. Nay he highly applauds his first Reformers, whose conscience no doubt was tainted with the same *leaven*. The *Material Schism* then, which was manifestly your fact, is made *formal* by your want of *evidence*, that the doctrine was *erroneous* and consequently her Government violable; Both which joyn'd together give you in plain termes your own name of *flat proper and formal Schismaticks*, and entitle you to all the bed-roll of vices and curses which you hoarded up for your self and your friends in your first Chapter.

SECT. II.

The Doctors argument, that the Popes power in England was deriv'd under the Kings Concession, refuted.

BUt it is now high time to returne to overlook the work; who, after the declaration of the matter of fact, confesses no great hold can be taken from the freeness of the Clergy's determination, and therefore *the whole difficulty devolves to this one enquiry, whether the Bishop of Rome were Supreme Head or Governour of the Church of England in the reign of King* Henry *the eighth.* That is, we are come about again to the beginning of the Book. But I am mistaken, he tells us he hath largely disproved, in his

his Chap. 4, 5, 6. *all pretensions from St.* Peters *Supremacy, and from Englands Conversion*; (to whose particular answers I refer the Reader for full satisfaction) and he has now invented a new ground of the Popes Supremacy in England, to wit, *the voluntary Concession of our Kings.* What the Doctor meanes I cannot imagine. *Some particular priviledges*, and (as I may say) *pious curtesies* have, out of a special respect, been granted by our Kings to that See, to whom they owe their first knowledge of Christ, and his Law; but these are not the thing in debate; The right of Supreme Authority is our question; now, who ever held this to come from the *Concession of our Kings?* Yet this ayr-beating Champion of *Schism* first fancies this to be our *tenet*, and then beats it all to dirt. He is as valiant as *Sir John Falstaff*; let him tell his own story, and hee'l make you beleeve he has kill'd eleven Enemies, when but one opposed him. We onely found the *Popes Primacy* upon his Succession to *St. Peter*: This is the onely adversary-point the Doctor is to combate, which he hath most weakly opposed with grosse mistakes, palpable contradictions to Scripture, and pinning all the words that made for his purpose to every testimony, as hath been shew'd: But to counterfeit a triumph, he makes every trivial thing, done either by or about the Pope, to be the very ground of his *Primacy*, and then falls to work and impugnes them as really, as if he thought we held them. The Pope cannot doe any good action, or convert a Nation, but that must be the ground of his Universal Pastorship over us, and be impugned accordingly; A beggerly penny

cannot be given to the Pope by our Kings for pious uses, and out of a gratefull obligation, but the poore *Peter-pence* and such like petty grants must presently be the Popes Universal Authority, given him by the Concession of our Kings, and that, as such, must be impugned. The Kings of *England*, *France*, &c. cannot be said by *G. de Heimburgh* to be free from swearing obedience to the Pope at their instalment (an obligation peculiar to the Empire of *Germany*) but presently the Doctor concludes hence *an absolute power in our Princes*; I suppose he means in *Ecclesiastical matters*, for in *temporal*, none denies it; so as now the very ceremony of swearing obedience to the Pope, is become the very granting of the *formal universal Pastorship*; and they that doe it not are concluded to be free from the Popes Jurisdiction; though he knows well enough, that the King of *France*, who as he confesses performes no such ceremonious courtesie towards him, acknowledg'd notwithstanding himselfe subject to him, as the Head of Gods Church. Lastly, (which he touches here againe) he cannot read in some Authors that Kings *de facto executed the erecting and removing of Patriarchates*, though the testimony doe not exclude the Churches fore-ordering it; but presently the Popes Universal Power must be supposed to be transdignifi'd into a private *Patriarchate*, and as a *Patriachate* impugned. Thus nothing can come amiss to the Doctor: Every argument he undertakes to manage is equally strong and unresistable. A pot-gun will serve him to batter downe the walls of *Rome*. He was borne a Controvertist; and it is an even wager whether hee

he

be better in the gift of *Use* and *Application*, or in the Art of *Dispute* and *Confutation*.

Next comes another *Dilemma* or forked Argument, which though, proceeding on the former false supposition, needs no answer; yet for the Readers recreation we will afford a glance. First, it is observable, that he never brings this bug-bear Argument upon the stage, but when he has made a Prologue for it of some forg'd supposition of his own; and then the Thing, in vertue of that, acts and talkes through the vizard of a mistake; and yet, ere it comes to a Conclusion, the Doctors weak reason cracks to make both ends meet. The summe of it is this, that *The Authority of the Pope was either originally in our Kings, so as they could lawfully grant it to the Pope, or not; if not, then the grant was invalid: If it were, then either the same power remaines still in the King to dispose of it to some other; or else, it does not remaine in him, and then is his power diminish't, and so the Act is againe invalid.* I answer, the Authority of the Pope was never held, by concession of our Kings, in any other sence than this, that our Kings (as all other Christian Kings did) yeelded him what they held as of Faith to be due to him, that is, *Supremacy in Ecclesiastical matters*; and therefore that they not onely lawfully granted it, but could not deny it, except most unlawfully. Therfore their act of yeelding to it was not invalid, but very valid for what it was intended, which was to expresse their obligation in deferring to the Head of the Church what was his due. Wherefore he cannot dispose of it to any other or C.7. S.8.

remove it, since the Papacy (which is the thing in question) was never imagin'd at any private Kings disposal till Doctor *Hammonds* time. Again his inference, that if it were in the Kings Power, the same Power remaines still in them to dispose of it, is as groundless as the former; for we see by experience that Kings often diminish their power, by yeelding sometimes Forts, sometimes an Island or Country, to an over-powering enemy; and yet that act of theirs held valid notwithstanding.

Then (to prove this assertion) as the fellow that put foure kinds of men that pray, some that pray for others and not for themselves, othersome for themselves not others, some for themselves and others, but some *neither for themselves* nor others; or the Preacher, upon the Text *seek and you shall finde*, put four kinde of seekers, some that seek and finde not, others that finde and seek not, others that both finde and seek, but others that neither seek nor find:

C. 7. Sect. 9. So the Doctor tells us here, that there are two *sorts of gifts*, one that is so given that it is given; another that is so given that it is kept with the giver; that is, not given; And then brings for an instance this curious peece of *Philosophy*. *Thus the Sun communicates his beames, and with them his warmth and influence, and yet retaines all which it thus communicates, and accordingly withdraweth them againe.*

C. 7. Sect. 10 This Book (as the Reader must conceive) is the Doctors *Encyclopædia*, encompassing at once the *whole world of Sciences*. He hath before given us notice of Scriptures, Fathers, Councils, History, Law, Greek, Hebrew, Grammar, and Criticismes:

now

now he gives here a proof of Philosophy and knowledge of Nature, and lets thee understand so strange a truth as no man, unlesse he were out of his wits, could imagine; to wit, that the very beames, sent hither by the Sun, are notwithstanding retain'd there still; and therefore are in more far-distant places at the same time; so granting, that the ordinary course of Nature performes more in a creature, than he will grant Gods omnipotency can work in the glorify'd body of our Lord Creator in the ever-blessed Sacrament. Nay more, he assures us that the *Sun ACCORDINGLY withdraweth* them again. What he meanes by *ACCORDINGLY* in that place I cannot tell; lesse can I understand how the Sun *withdrawes his beames again*; I see indeed effects in Nature of warmth witnessing that they remain here incorporated in other bodies, but I see no natural causes to bandy the Suns beames back to him; much lesse pullyes and long strings in the Sun to withdraw them (as the Doctor expresses it) *accordingly* too. But the Doctor had fram'd his observation from the accesse and recesse of the beames of a candle in his own eyes, when he was drowsie; and dreamt it seemes that night, that the eye of Heav'n had the like faculty.

Your next parity from God Almighty shoots beyond the mark: No bargain can be made with him by reason of his Universal Dominion over his creatures by which they may challenge a proprietary right to his gifts; therefore none with Kings over their fellow-creatures; that is something impious, unless you had moderated the harsh-sounding expression: Neither

are we properly our own, for so we might dispose of our own life at pleasure, and the Book of your *Donne*, holding self-murder lawful, might pass as allowable, whose wit knew better how to maintain a Paradox and with more plausible grounds; then you doe your Faith. But the truth is, that God never takes away what he gives; but is then said to take away any thing, when he withholds his bountifull hand from a further bestowing it.

This supposed, he tells us the King retaines yet the power granted to the Pope, and so may dispose of it to a Bishop of his own; and that the Kings power frees them from that obedience and cleares the whole businesse of Schism. Alas! what a weak reed you catch at to secure you from falling into the gulfe of Schism! *Huic ipsi partono opus est quem defensorem paras.* Your Patron, the King, needs a Patron himselfe. You should first evidence that the King might lawfully renounce the so long possessed, so universally acknowledg'd authority over himselfe as well as his subjects in Ecclesiastical matters, ere you lanch forth into such self-said, and self-authoriz'd Conclusions; otherwise to run wildly forwards on your own feign'd and false suppositions, first that his title of Universal Pastor comes by Concession of our Kings; next, that our Kings were not found subject to that Authority; and thirdly (which is yet higher) that our Kings are over that Authority and can dispose of it at pleasure; such voluntary talking as this, I say, is better for a Sermon to your good women, where all Coine goes currant, than for a controversie, where no progress is allowable

but

but what is already made good by undeniable testimonies and well-grounded Reasons.

He shuts up the Paragraph with talking of the *Popes* willingness to *enlarge his Territory*. True Sir, the Church is his Territory, which he is dayly both willing and industrious to enlarge, by converting barbarous Nations to Christs Faith; as he did once ours amongst the rest; for which you are so thanklesly disacknowledging. This Territory we hope and pray may be enlarged beyond the envy of all maligners, till *all the Ends of the Earth*, and *plenitudo Gentium* the whole company of the Gentiles *shall see the salvation of God*. Among whom the Church that Heaven-planted Tree, which beares *folia ad sanitatem Gentium* is even at this day spreading out her sacred branches; and the Authority of her Head goes on not intensively but extensively enlarging; while your poor broken bough, rootless and sapless, shrinks dayly into nothing, resolved already into its first principles, of a few seditious, disobedient spirits; whom at first common hatred and then fragrant factiousness against the Church held together; now, that being a far off and such a common interest not so necessary, the spirit of Schism, kept in a while by humane policy, begins at length to work, and like a swelling torrent scornes to be held in by a weak bank of turfe, which once forc't its passage through the midst of a *Rock*; and with good reason too, for why should an *acknowledg'd fallibility* bridle them now, whom before an *acknowledg'd infallibility* could not restrain.

But you would make Queen *Mary* co partner in your Schism, and alledge her retaining for C. 7. Sect. 11

some

some time the title of *Head of* the Church; and her refusing to admit of a Legate from *Rome*; which things you say *will make it lesse strange, that this Supreme Power of the Popes should be disclaimed in the time of King* Henry *the eighth.* Yet, as for the first, you know well enough that she never pretended it as her lawful title, but onely permitted that the former phrase of the Lawes, which nick-named her so, might be used; till she, having setled the turbulent spirits, raised by your good doctrine, which opposed her renouncing it, found an handsom occasion to disclaim that title, usurp'd by her late Predecessors. Your selfe confessing, that *she urg'd the matter afterwards in a Parliament, and with much difficulty obtained it.* Which plainly cleares her, and makes your bringing her Authority upon the stage very frivolous, the fact being acknowledgedly against her will. But I see not how it can excuse you; rather it accuses your Brethren at that time both of schism and impudence, in forcing their Princess to retain an unjustly assumed title against both her Will and her Conscience. What force he puts in her denying a Legate no man knowes, unless he could dive into the mysterious depth of the Doctors thoughts. For, besides that there was another Legate in *England* at that time, All Catholick Countries when they saw it convenient have done the same, and yet are reputed true sons of the Church, since they retaine as humble an Obedience to the See of *Rome*, and as firmly acknowledge her authority as those who admit them. But I see the Doctor knowes not in what the absolute Supremacy (as he calls it) of the Pope consists; Every wa-

ving

ving of any request or favour is with him a flat denial and rejection of the Authority; as if they who denied the former Kings of *England* subsidies, deny'd them to be Monarchs or Heads of the Common-wealth. Neither can I see that this, as you fancy, makes your breach *lesse strange*; but rather much stranger, that whereas *Rome* was so farre from that tyranny falsely by you imputed to her, that you might have (as Queen *Mary* and as Catholick Kings now doe) deny'd to admit the Popes Legats, and all such flowers of pious friendship, or (as you will call them) extravagant encroachments, and yet have remained in true charity with the faithful and Communion with that your Superiour; yet neither this moderate carriage nor any thing else could satisfie your resolute and desperate disobedience; but to reject the very Authority it selfe, utterly to extirpate it root and branch, and *cast it out of this Island.* C. 7. Sect. 5

This renouncing then of the chiefest Authority of the Church you left, you call, in a strange expression the *Bottome* upon which the *Foundation of Reformation was laid*; upon which by the same workmen (who pulled downe a good house to build a worse) was *erected a superstructure*: in King *Henry*'s dayes, *the number of the Sacraments, translation of the Bible, and the use of the Lords prayer in the English Tongue*; as if the Lords Prayer was never used in the vulgar language till King *Henry*'s *bolinesse* ordained it. As for the Kings Vicar-general, who presided in his *duely-assembled Councel* (as you call it) I can say no more of him, but he was a proper fellow. *Domini similis*, like his C. 7. Sect. 12

Master

Master; Vicegerent to him in that high and mighty title of the Chief of Schismaticks, the rotten *Head* of the corrupted *body*.

But Mr. Doctor proceeds in his *Schism, much farther advanced* (as he tells us) *in King* Edwards *dayes*: Yet first he is resolved to clear the way, and remove a rub which he apprehends very dangerous, to wit, lest we should think to prove the acts made in his dayes invalid and vilifie them, because the King was yet alas but a child, assuring us therefore that the Lawes of this Realm ordain that what is done by the Protector is done by the Child, and that too, as well as if the Child had been a man. But I will secure the Doctor of his feare; for though the child had been a man and had had as many wives as his Father, yet neither he nor they had been a jot further from being plain Schismaticks; unless this child or man had been wiser, holier, and older than all Gods Church, so to justifie the breach which his Father had made.

C. 7: Sect. 13

Very pitiful then had been the Doctors refuge, had the infant King the Head of their Church been at yeares of discretion; but yet far more pitiful is it, the then Protector steering the helm of the Common-wealth; whose traiterous and ambitious designe to intercept Queen *Mary*'s succession being manifestly discover'd, whatever he acted against Catholicks or their Religion (Q. *Mary*'s supporters) ought in all reason but the Doctors be rather imputed to interest than piety. But nothing can prejudice (as he thinks) the regularity of his Reformation. Schism once admitted, as sacred, no wonder if tyranny, treachery and ambition be not

onely lawful but pious and commendable. Yet his tyranny in secular matters is become even the *Supream Power in Ecclesiastical*; and so the Reformation goes on in the Doctors Book currantly and merrily; especially though some Bishops resisted and were punisht, yet (as the Doctor sayes) *Arch-Bishop Cranmer* (who kept a Wench in King *Henries* time) and the far greater number of Bishops joyning with him, all is well and the Reformation valid: Then to cry quits with us for their persecuting our Bishops, he puts us in mind how their friends in *Queen Maries* dayes, were not onely persecuted with *fire* but with *fagot* too; To answer which, let the Dr. but clear those malefactors from *Schisme* and Sedition, and we shall acknowledge the cruelty ours, and the innocency theirs; otherwise let them remember our pretended *persecution* was onely *execution of justice*, and theirs a most sacrilegious and irreligious tyranny. But I smell by the Dr. that he hath been in *John Foxes* kennel.

The Reformations he mentions, introduced in the Popedom of this head junior of their Church, are *many changes* (as the Dr. tells us) and *recessions from the doctrine and practises of Rome*. That is now grown reason enough to think all that was done to be lawfully done; Besides (saith he) *That of Images, the lawfulnesse of the marriage of the Clergy was asserted*, (the Dr. likes that point of faith dearly) *the English Liturgy formed*, the people got wine to their bread, &c. But that ill-favord, &c. dashes out the best. Then, then it was (the Dr. should have added) that those two sweet singers of *Israel*, *Hopkins* and *Sternhold*, (as *Cleveland* expresses it) murdered

C.7. Sect.14

murdered the Psalmes over and over, with Another to the same; then did the Later of these in a fit of divine fury no doubt, bid God, *give his foes a rap.*

Then, then it was that that second *Solomon*, *Robert Wisedom*, inspired questionless from Heaven, warbled out that melodious and exquisit hymn, which with a sweet twang closes up the book of Psalmes.

Preserve us Lord, by thy dear word,
From Turk and Pope, defend us Lord.

And the rest of that devout piece, able to ravish any Christian heart to hear it. These and such other rarities of Reformation were then added, as harmonious *Epithalamiums* to this under-age Bride-Church, to celebrate her espousals or matriage with her Infant-Head.

After this the Dr. treates of the Reformation
C. 7. made under *Queen Elizabeth* in his 15. Para-
Sect. 15. graph, consisting of five or six lines on either side a long *Parenthesis*; which *Parenthesis* tells us partly strange news, that Queens as well as Kings have according to our Laws Regal Power; partly open fictions, that this *plenitude of power is as well in Sacred as Civil affairs*; and that they have this by *the Constitution of our Monarchy.* Whereas he cannot but know there had been many a Monarch in England, ere their Schismatical Laws were made, which first allowed the King a *plenitude of power in sacred matters.*

In the next place he touches the ordination of their new created Bishops, *evidenced* (as he saith) out of the *records* to have been *performed*

according to the ancient Canons by the imposition of the hands of the Bishops. Yet this modest evidencing Record durst never shew its head for about fifty years, notwithstanding the outcries made by Catholicks against the pretended ordinations of Protestant Bishops, and strong presumptions to the contrary: till at length, when the memory of that present age was past, which might discountenance that pretence and argue it of impudence, out steps a new old Record assuring us that they were regularly ordained. And this is the firmest *Basis* the Protestant Ministry or Bishops have, to witnesse that they have any more Authority to preach then an Anabaptistical Zelot, whose profession is perhaps a Weaver; his Calling, his own Intrusion; his Pulpit a Tub, and his Diocesse a Conventicle. But suppose you had a *material Mission* from the hands of Catholick Bishops, and that *Mr. Mason* had vindicated you in this point; yet can either *Mr. Mason* or any else even pretend to manifest that those Catholick Bishops gave you a Mission, that is, sent and Authorised you to preach Protestant Doctrines, or could do it, in case they would, having no such power from the Church, from whom they have all their power. Unlesse you evidence this, both *Mr. Mason* and *Dr. Hammond* may as well say nothing. For since they gave you no such authority as you make use of, that is to preach against the formerly received Faith; nor sent you any such errand as you now declare and preach, it follows that whatever you do to prejudice and extinguish that doctrine (to propagate which they meant your Mission) is done onely upon your own head, without any authority but your own

selfe-assumed licentiousnesse to talk and say what you list; not derived from the consecrated hands of your Catholick Ordainers, but from your own *unhallowed schismatical hearts.*

C. 7. Sect. 17 But Mr. Dr. is *always afraid, where no fear* is; answering at large here a supposed objection of ours against Q. *Elizabeth* for unchairing some Bishops and installing others. But (alas!) I am more courteous to the Queen than the Doctor imagines, and think no worse of her, but onely that in that fact she did *after kind*; for supposing her once *the Head of Schismaticks* and *Chief-Bishopesse* of their Church, I see no reason but she should depose Bishops, Catholikely affected, and install heretical ones; and in a word, she and her Bishops vote and act whatever they thought good, and I cannot tell what should hinder them, since the now rejected Authority of Gods Church could not. All the superstructures of the Reformation then, which the Doctor so often and so largely in this Chapter hath shown to be *done regularly*, I grant him to have been done as *regularly* as his own heart could wish or mans wit imagine; for the Authority of the Church being schismatically renounced, and the infallible rule of Faith, which could onely oblige men to an unanimous beleefe, being broken and rejected; these grounds, I say, being layed, I yeeld that the superstructure not onely of their heresie, but even of *Lutheranism*, *Zuinglianism*, *Calvinism*, *Arminianism*, *Puritanism*, *Brownism*, *Socinianism*, *Presbyterianism*, *Anabaptism*, with those of *Quakers* and *Adamites*, but even of *Turcism* and *Atheism*, were all very regular, orderly, rational and connatural superstructures,

upon

upon the forelaid foundations. The ruine of all Faith must needs accompany the renouncing of Certainty.

Yet I had forgot to let the Reader see how the Doctor excuses the Queen for devesting some Bishops of their dignity; and his excuse is, because those Bishops refused *to take the oath of Supremacy*; concluding that therefore she dealt *justly in devesting those Bishops, which thus refused to secure her Government, or to approve their fidelity to their lawfull Soveraign.* By which one may see the Doctor knowes not the difference between the oath of *Allegiance* and the oath of *Supremacy*. The oath of Allegiance or fidelity was instituted expresly for that purpose; what needed she then presse them to take the oath of Supremacy, to *approve their Fidelity or Allegiance*; cannot one be a true subject to his King by acknowledging him his Liege Soveraign, unless he will take his oath he is Head of the Church? As if neither any of the former Kings of *England*, nor any of the Catholike Princes that now are or ever have been, had so much as one true subject, because none of them takes the Oath of Supremacy.

What followes, is onely a narration how the Schism went on and the rent was made worse. C. 7. At length he shuts up this Chapter, by pronouncing an absolute *Negative* of their guiltiness of Schism, from this *one evidence, that all was done by those to whom, and to whom onely the rightful power legally pertained*, to wit, *the King and Bishops of this Nation.* So as the King must be Head of the Church, that's concluded, though all the world say and swear the con-

trary, though himselfe have not brought one expres word to prove it: Nay more, he hath *EVIDENCE* it is no Schism, because the King and the Bishops voted it; as if whatsoever the King and Bishops vote, let it be what schismatical doctrine it will, though *Socianism* and *Turcism*, it must not be schismatical; so blind is prejudice, that it can neither see without its own spectacles, nor beyond its own narrow limits. The Doctor discourses all this Chapter long, as if he made account all the world were compriſed in one poor corner of it, *England*; like the home-bred fellow that thought the Sun set at the next town; if a King or Queen here with a few Bishops, partly out of feare, partly out of favour, some out of malice (and contradicted by others) decree any thing, it makes the case irrefragable in the Doctors judgment: Not considering (which yet any prudent man would) that the whole world, whom before they accounted onely Catholick, and in which had been hundreds of Kings Queens and Bishops, nay perhaps thousands for one of theirs, had ever condemned by their contrary beliefe these Votes and Acts to bee scismatical and heretical. Besides, this King before the breach acknowledging himselfe subject to that Authority in Ecclesiastical matters, as all Catholick Kings now doe, and as all his Ancestor-Kings ever since *Englands* conversion had done, it must be, as I have told you often, most apparent evidence, and such as greater cannot be imagin'd, which may warrant him to exalt himselfe above the Popes Authority, so long setled in possession, and that in those very things in which before he was acknowledgedly

ledgedly under him; especially the contrary verdict of such an universality, as I have before mention'd, with its weight not to be counterpois'd, preponderating, and mightily prejudicing any pretence of *Evidence*. Again, if the thing were *evident*, how happened it that no Christian King till the time of King *Henry* the eighth, and in his time none but he should discern this clear *evidence*, unless perhaps (though they say *love is blind*, yet) his desire to *Anna Bullen* did open his eyes in such miraculous manner, that he saw by the heavenly light of her bright star-like eyes, that the Pope was Antichrist, his Authority unlawful; and himselfe, who was then found under it in Ecclesiastical matters, to be indeed above it, in case the Popes spiritual power should cross his carnal pleasure.

To conclude my answer to this Chapter, I would ask two things of Mr. Doctor; one is, in case a King should have broke from the Church, and brought in Schism into his Country, whether it could probably be perform'd in any other manner than the very method by which their Reformation was introduced? The other is whether the Reformation be yet perfectly compleat, or rather that Queen *Elizabeth* swept the Church indeed, but left the dust sluttishly behind the door; if it be not yet compleat, I would gladly know how far this Reformation and Receeding from *Rome* may proceed; and what be the certain stints, and limits of this rowling Sea, which it may not pass? For I see no reason in the Doctors grounds, but if the secular powers think it convenient, they may reform still end-wayes

as they please, nay even, if they list, deny *Christ* to be God; an acute Socinian will solve very plausibly all the objections out of Scripture, and produce allegations, which I doubt not he will make far stronger, than the Doctor doth his against the Pope; nor will there want some obscure testimonies out of Antiquity, and express ones from the *Arrian* Hereticks to evince the *Tenet*; if this then were voted by a King, some of his Bishops and a Parliament, the Doctor must not disobey and hold Christs Divinity; since the thing was done by them to whom (as the Doctor sayes) *rightfull power legally pertain'd.* They having no infallibility then, may happen to vote such a thing; and the Doctor having no infallible certainty to the contrary, ought not *recede* from his lawful Superiours, so as upon these grounds all religion may be reformed into Atheism; and (the infallibility of the Church once denied) the temporal Power hath no reason to have his rightful authority stinted, but at pleasure to make Reformation upon Reformation from generation to generation, *per omnia sæcula sæculorum.*

THE

THE THIRD PART.

Containing the answers to the foure last Chapters of Dr. Hammonds *Schism.*

SECT. I.

Doctor Hammonds *second sort of Schism, and his pretence that they retain the way to preserve Unity in Faith, refuted.*

MAfter *Hammond* hath at length finish't his greatest task, and done preaching of the *first species of Schism, as it is an offence against the subordination, which Christ hath by himselfe and his Apostles setled in the Church*; and is now arrived to the second sort, as it *signifies an offence against the mutual unity, peace and charity, which Christ left among his Disciples.* C. 8. Sect. 1.

This Schism against Charity, *for methods sake*, (as he tells us) he divides into three *species*. Sect. 2. The *first is a Schism in the Doctrine or Traditions, a departure from the unity of the Faith once delive-*

red to the Saints, *from the institutions of Christ, of the Apostles and of the Universal Church of the first and purest times, whether in Government or practises*, &c. Where first this methodical Dr. makes *Faith* and *Charity* all one; putting his *Schism against Faith* for the first *species* of his *Schism* against *mutual Charity*. Next, he ranks also the rejecting Christs Institution of *Government* under this second *species* of *Schism against Charity*, which most evidently was the first General Head of *Schism* hitherto treated of; that is, of the *Offence against Subordination setled by Christ in the Church*: For Christ could not settle such a *subordination* in the Church, but he must at the same time *institute the Government of the Church*; since there can be neither *subordination* without *Government*, nor *Government* without *subordination*. So as now the *Schism* against *Government* is come to be one of the *Schisms against mutual Charity*; and, to mend the matter, comprehended under the same Head with *Schism against Faith*. Was ever such a confusion heard of? And yet, all this is done (saith the Doctor) *for methods sake*.

But to proceed, the second *species* of his *Schism* against *mutual Charity*, is an *offence against external peace and Communion Ecclesiastical*. Where I find as much blundering as formerly. For these words must either signifie an *Offence* against Superiors and *Governors of the Church*; and then it is again co-incident both with the first general Head of *Schism*, which dissolves
Sect. 2. the *subordination* of the Churches subjects; and also with the first particular *species* of *Schism against mutual Charity*, which (according to the Doctors method) included a breach from the

Co-

Government instituted by Christ. Or else, they must signifie an Offence against the mutually and equally-due correspondence and Charity, which one fellow-member ought to have to another; and then it falls to be the same with his third and last *species*, which he calls, *The want of that Charity which is due from every Christian to every Christian.* So that, if the jumbling all the Bells together in a confused disorder may be called *musical*, then the Doctors division may be styled methodical.

After this, he subdivides this first *species*, (to wit, *Schism against Faith*) into *A departure from those Rules appointed by Christ for the founding and upholding truth in the Church*; and into *The asserting particular doctrins contrary to Christs and the Apostolical pure Churches establishment.* But first he cleares himself of the former of these by answering our suggestion (as he calls it) that *in casting out the Authority of the Bishop of Rome, they have cast off the Head of all Unity.* To which he tells us *the answer is obvious*; *First that the Bishop of Rome was never appointed by Christ to be the Head of all Christian Unity, or that Church to be the conservatory for ever of all Christian Truth, more than any other Bishop or Church of the Apostles ordaining or planting.* Where I find almost as many absurdities hudled together as words. For first, what signifies *the Bp. of Rome was not appointed by Christ?* *Christ* was not on earth when St. *Peters* Successors in the See of *Rome*, sate there; and when he ordained St. *Peter* chief of the Apostles, Saint *Peter* was not yet *Bishop of Rome.* Next, if he meanes that St. *Peter* was not appointed by our Saviour, as the *Head of Christian Unity*, St. *Hierom's* testimony, I suppose, will

C. 8. S. 3.

C. 8. Sect. 4.

will be as good as the Doctors word, who tels us, *Inter duodecim*, &c. *Amongst the, twelve one was choſen, that A HEAD being conſtituted*, the *OCCASION OF SCHISM MIGHT BE TAKEN AWAY.* Where we ſee expreſly Saint *Peter*, the Popes Predeceſſor, was advanced to be *HEAD*; and this to take away occaſion of *Schiſm*, that is, to be *HEAD OF CHRISTIAN UNITY.* Thirdly, hence alſo follows that Chriſtian Unity is *conſerved by him more than by any other Biſhop*, contrary to the Doctors aſſertion. Fourthly, he equivocates in the word *Roman Church*, and takes in it a ſence which he knowes we never mean't. Our acception of it being of the Univerſal Church communicating with the Mother Church of *Rome*; his, of the private Dioceſs of *Rome* it ſelfe. Fifthly, it is groundleſs to affirm, even of this private Church of *Rome* it ſelfe, that ſhe *is not the conſervatory of Chriſtian Truth more than any other*; ſince the Doctor cannot but know the Fathers are of a contrary beleefe, holding that the two chief Apoſtles, dying there, bequeathed to that Church, as a ſacred Legacy, a greater vigour of Chriſtian Tradition. Again, Hiſtories and Fathers witneſſing ſo unanimouſly her firm perſiſtance above the reſt; objections often urged by our Authors to that purpoſe; the Doctor might at leaſt have afforded us one teſtimony of the contrary, beſides his own bare saying. Laſtly, what is the Doctors intent in saying *Chriſt did not appoint the Church of Rome conſervatory (for ever) of all Chriſtian truth?* What meanes this canting *Parentheſis* (*for ever*) As if Chriſt might perhaps appoint her to conſerve truth for a while, but meant after ſome time

Hierom. contra Jovinian.

to discharge her of that office. But this *Parenthesis* the Doctor reserved for a starting-hole, that he might at pleasure cry out *she had erred*, when he had found out some odd testimony, which with the help of an *id-est-clause* might overthrow the Authority of the whole World.

His second Defence for *relinquishing the means to preserve Unity of Faith*, which we charge them with, is this; that *The way provided by Christ and his Apostles for preserving the Unity of Faith, &c. is fully acknowledged by their Reformation. Which way* (sayes the Doctor) *is made up of two Acts of Apostolical Providence; First, their resolving upon some few heads of efficacy to the planting of Christian life through the world, and preaching and depositing them in every Church. Secondly, their establishing an excellent subordination of Church-officers*, &c. As for the first of these Acts (as he calls them) of *Apostolical Providence*; if these two Heads he speaks of, as thus deposited, be indeed sufficient to form a Christian life in order to the attainment of Eternal bliss, and that they came down certainly to us by this *depository* way at first in the Churches, and so derived successively age by age, Dr. *Hammond* is suddenly become a *Proselyte* and a plain *Papist*: For, we neither say we have any point of Faith superfluous for the Community of the Faithful; nor that those we have, came to us by any other meanes than *seruando depositum*, by preserving uncorrupted those *necessary* doctrines thus *deposited*. C. 7. Sect. 5 C. 7. Sect. 12

But I fear much, when the matter comes to scanning, Mr. *Hammond*, in this his doctrine, *neither goes to Church nor stayes at home*, but halts very

very lamely in the mid-way. He stayes not at home; for his Church of *England* is so far from holding the points deposited by the Apostles in Churches, a *certain* way to *preserve Unity of Faith*, that nothing is more abominable to her than the name of *Tradition*. This appeares by the sixth Article or Canon of Queen *Elizabeth's* female-headed General Council, where the Scripture is made the sole ground of Faith, and nothing affirmed as necessary to Salvation, but what is built upon it; whereas the Doctor here builds points *necessary to salvation* (for sure those *few heads of special efficacy to the planting a Christian life*, can be no lesse) upon their *preaching* and *depositing* them in the Churches; nay more, the Unity of Faith, that is, *Faith it self*, (for Faith, if not *one*, is *none*) upon this way of *depositing*. Yet for all this he will not goe to Church neither, though he stay not at home. For ask him, are those *few Heads* all that are necessary? he will tell you, *no*; yet which be those necessary Heads, how many, and why no more were thus delivered (since this he sayes is *A WAY TO PRESERVE UNITY IN FAITH*; and on the other side he sees what multiplicity is bred by the diverse interpretations of Scripture) ask him, I say, these questions, and no particular account can he give you; only he had a mind to say something in geneneral, lest he might be thought to have utterly contemned all Traditions.

C. 8. S. 5.

Again, these Churches, in which were deposited those *few Heads of such special efficacy to plant Christian life*, were they infallible, that is, such as we may certainly trust to in their preserving that *depositum*? if they were, they

they might as well be infallible in other necessary points also, and so the Doctor hath slipt, by good hap, into our *Rule of Faith*, and (though hoodwink't) goes to Church again. But if they be not *infallible*, that is, connot certainly tell us that they delivered us the right *depositum*, and the same they received, then the Dr. remaines as he is, and hath brought nothing to his purpose. For since Unity of Faith cannot be preserved without some efficacious meanes of bringing it down to us inerrably true, unless this depositing was such as must upon necessity continue for ever, (*which is that we call Infallibility*, or *Indefectibility* of the Church) the *providence of the Apostles* had been very sleight, and nothing at all to the Doctors purpose; that is, it had been no efficacious way to *preserve Unity of Faith*.

He addes afterwards, '*And all this is asserted and acknowledged by every true son of the Church of England as zealously as is pretended by any Romanist*. Here again the Doctor seemes to step forwards towards the Church, and to draw a great troup of backward unwilling Protestants after him. For if they hold (as I conceive he meanes by these words) the doctrines deposited in the Church, *as zealously as the Romanists*, they must hold them as of Faith; for so farre our well-grounded zeal carries us, and that the *depositary* is so trusty as it cannot deceive us. Now you see the Doctor is got as farre as the Church-door. But when he heares them within the Church talk that a company of men can be *Infallible*, he leaps you back at one jump as far as the Sceptick Schooles of the Heathen Academicks.

But

But how could Mr. *Hammond* imagine this pretence sufficient to acquit him from *Schism* in *renouncing the way to preserue Unity of Faith*, or to prove that he and his fellowes still *fully acknowledged it*. The way to preserve *Unity of Faith*, held by all the Christian world before their breach, was the beleefe of the Churches Infallibility; and we think mans wit cannot invent a better for that End. Either then, this must be the way to preserve *Unity in Faith*, or some other; if this, you manifestly broke and rejected it, as hath been shewn, and as the 19th Article of Queen *Elizabeths* new Creed professedly declares; if some other, whatever it is, it must needs include a *fallibility* and uncertainty in the Church, of the doctrine she teaches. Wherefore, either evidence to us that a *professed and beleeved fallibility* can be a better way to preserve *Unity in Faith*, than a *beleefe of Infallibility*; or else grant that *renouncing* the latter you renounced the best and most efficacious way to conserve such an *Unity*.

The second way to preserve Unity in Faith here mentioned by the Doctor (as fully and zealously acknowledged by him & his fellows) is the *establishment* by our Saviour and his Apostles of *an excellent subordination of all inferiour Officers of the Church to the Bishop in every City, of the Bishops in every province to their Metropolitans, of the Metropolitans in every region or Diocese to Patriarchs or Primates; allowing also amongst them such a primacy of Order or Dignity as might be proportionable to the πρῶτος Σίμων.* &c. Thus the Doctor. In answer to which, we will examine a while, whether this way, thus laid out, be indeed *the way to preserve Unity*

Faith! For, if notwithstanding this *subordination*, no Priest is bound to beleeve his *Bishop*, nor *Bishop* his *Metropolitan*, nor *Metropolitan* his *Patriarch*, how can this conduce to the Unity of Faith? But peradventure he will say this *subordination* in obedience is a great help to keep out errours, and then, if this be so, we must take into consideration how this point relates to *Unity of Government*, as it is a means to *conserve Truth*, the breaking of which Unity is called Schism. So the question in that case is reduced to the examine how his *subordination* provides against *Schism*. Let us admit then that all the world were made up of Churches governed in this Order as the Doctor hath put them; I would ask, if in the time of the *Arian* Heresie, a Priest had dissented from his Bishop, an *Arian*, but yet consented with his Metropolitan, had it been *schism* in so doing? The Doctor must answer, *No*; for the Metropolitan being of higher Authority than the Bishop, the adherence to him would more secure the Priest from schism, than the relinquishing the *Bishop* could endanger him. Next, if a Bishop dissent from an heretical Metropolitan, but consents with a Catholick Patriarch, is it yet *Schism*? Surely no, since the same reason clears him that cleared the Priest before. Again, if the Metropolitan dissent from his own Primate or Patriarch, but agree with all the rest, is it yet *schism*? Certainly no; for the collection of all the rest, being of greater Authority than any one in particular, can by consequence more excuse him, than the other can condemn him. Hitherto then we have found none of the Doctors *Amulets* against *Schism*. Let us proceed;

If

If a *Patriarch* dissent from the first, from the Doctors πρῶτος Σίμων, but yet concedes to all the rest, is it yet *schism?* The Doctor answers, no; For in regard he owed the other onely something more of a civil respect, as a younger brother does an Elder, without any inferiority to him in Command or Jurisdiction, it cannot be a *Schism.* Forwards still; Suppose some Nation or some Patriarch dissent from a General Council, is it yet Schism, still the Dr. answers, *No*; for in his third Chapter, which branch't Schism into all its *Species*, he put no such *schism* as that against a *General Council.* How then hath Mr. *Hammond* by this new way provided against Schism, if according to this *Subordination*, all the Church may fall together by the eares, and all may find lawful excuses to secure them from being *Scismaticks*; since the œconomy of that distracted Family is so order'd, that neither any one in particular, nor any in common, have any tie to hold them to the rest, without which ty of consent in matters of faith, this imagin'd subordination can no way be a meanes to preserve Unity of Faith; and consequently the Drs. Church-government (without some stronger obligation to knit up all this Order in an Unity) is not an *Act of Providence*, either worthy our Saviour or his Apostles.

C. 7. Sect. 17

But what is become of the King or Emperour all this while, is he no body now, who before was the Chief? It seemes the Apostles made no reckoning of him in all their *Providence.* It is wonderful Mr. *Hammond* should so forget himself, and proceed so inconsonantly to his own grounds; that, whereas before the

Kin

King was *Chief Governour*, *Head of* the Church, *Supreme* in *Ecclesiastical* matters, over and above both *Metropolitans* and *Patriarchs*, &c. Now in treating the Government of the Church, instituted to *preserve the Unity of Faith*, he thinks the *Head of the Church*, whom he had formerly *exalted above all that is called HOLY*, not worth the mentioning. Does he think the Unity of such a Head conduces nothing to the *preservation of Unity in Faith*, which yet he grants to a far more inferiour, Bishop? or accounts he it a small sin for a *Patriarch* to dissent from so Sacred a Head of his Church, and his lawful *Superiour*, nay *Supreme in Ecclesiastical matters*, and to whom the rightful power (as the Doctor told us) *in those things legally pertaines?* Yet Mr. *Hammond* had good reason to omit it. For though he may talk of, and advance that doctrine in common, so to escape the *Supremacy* of the *Pope* (for you must conceive that he had rather have even a *Bramble* rule over their Church, than that all-o're-spreading *Cedar*, the *Bishop* of *Rome*) yet he declines it as handsomely as he can, when he should apply that doctrine to particulars, as is seen in our present case. For indeed who would not laugh at him, if he had told us (as he must, had he introduced the King) that it was the heighth of *Schism* to dissent in a point of Faith from a Thing which neither the Catholikes, nor yet Protestants (as you here see) acknowledge; but a kind of a Lay-Elder, an Office, which (were it not three dayes older) might seem borrowed from their dearly-beloved brethren the *Presbyterians*.

Yet the Doctor is grown kind; and allows that

C.8. S.5. that the Scripture grants to *S. Peter* some *Primacy of Order, or Dignity.* If so, Mr. *Hammond*, then, for any thing you know, it may be a *Primacy of Jurisdiction*; And it stands onely upon the certainty of your, and our interpretation of Scripture, whether it signifie such a *Primacy* or no. Neither indeed could it be any other, if any hold may be taken from your words. For *S. Peter*, as you grant, and as the words πρῶτος Σίμων *Simon, the first of the Apostles*, plainly evidence, had some kind of *Primacy then given him*; and if it were then given him, he then had it, that is, he had it in our Saviours life time; but you told us before that *S. John* had the *dignity of place* (which is the same with *Primacy of Order*) *before all others in Christs life time, even before S. Peter himselfe:* The *Primacy* then which *S. Peter* had *in Christs life time*, must be some other *Primacy*; and what *Primacy* could this be, but the *Primacy of Jurisdiction?* Again, if by this *Primacy* he allows *S. Peter*, he means such a precedency as hath any effect or efficacity in the Church according to the nature and degree of a *Primacy*; this is all the substance of the Popes Authority, and all that is held by us as of Faith; but if he means by *Primacy* there, a meerely inefficacious and dry *Presidency* and *Precedency* of *Order*; such as is with us the walking on the right hand, or sitting first at a Table, without any superiority more than a courteous deference of the rest; then the Doctor must imagine our Blessed Saviour had no better thing to do, when he made *S. Peter the first*, but to take order, for feare the good Apostles should fall to complement, who should sit, go, or speak,

C.4. S.14.

in

in the first place: and consequently this tenet (being an Act of our Saviours, registerd in Scripture) must bee a courteous point of Faith, obliging all the Apostles, under pain of damnation, to be civil, and make a leg to *S. Peter*.

In the next paragraph the Doctor is full of *feares and jealousies*, and makes a great doubt that *the subjection of this Church to the Authority of the Bishop of Rome will never be likely to tend to the Unity of the whole.* And why think you so, Mr. Doctor? doe you not find evidently that the Church (before *Luther* and K. *Henry* renounced the said Authority) enjoy'd most perfect peace and tranquillity, as those who are under that government doe most blessedly now? and on the contrary, that after that Authority was rejected, nothing has succeeded the rejecters, but perpetual turmoiles, schisms, divisions and subdivisions into Sects; and daily mutations in Faith and Government, as far as the temporal sword did not hinder them. Is not this as evident as all History, and even our very eyes can witnesse a truth? Lastly, doe not the present distractions you now groan under awake you, to see that the source of all your misery springs from the *leaking Cistern of Schism* you have digg'd for your selves? Did your Ancestours find so little *Unity* under the Government of the *Roman Catholike Church*, or have you found such a constant Unity since you left it, that you can presume the re-admitting that Government *is never likely to tend to Unity*? Yet you cannot think otherwise, *unlesse all other Churches of Christians paid that subjection too.* Do you your obligation; why should their backwardnes C. 8. S. 7.

wardness in their duties make you deny yours? Besides, whom doe you call Christians? all that cry *Lord, Lord*, that is, professe the name of Christ, but deny the onely certain Rule to come to the knowledge of his Law? such as were the *Gnosticks*, *Carpocratians*, *Donatists*, *Socinians*, and all the hereſies that ever aroſe ſince the infancy of the Church; or doe you mean by the word *Christians*, onely thoſe, *qui faciunt voluntatem Patris, doe the will of our heavenly Father*, that is, *all that hear the Church*, or have a certain and common Rule to know what Christs Law is? if ſo, all theſe acknowledge *ſubjection* to the *Head Biſhop* of *Rome*, never denied by any but thoſe, who, at the ſame time they denied it, caſt themſelves out of the Church, refuſing to *hear her*.

You ſay *the Eaſtern Churches had not acknowledg'd it ere your departure*. Admit they had not: can their pattern warrant you (more than it can warrant the *Arrians*, *Neſtorians*, *Eutychians*, &c.) unleſs you be certain they did well in it? They rejected it indeed, and for their reward were by all the Chriſtian world (till you, falling into the ſame fault, began to call them Brothers) and by all your Anceſtours juſtly held and called *Schiſmaticks*. Yet, when they were in their right mood, they admitted it as much as any *Roman-Catholike*, as appeares in the Acts of the *Florentine* Council, to which they ſubſcribed; nay even when they were diſguſted and refuſed Unity, they *acknowledged the power of the Biſhop of Rome*; as appeares by a teſtimony of *Gerſon*, cited by your friend Biſhop *Bramhall* againſt himſelfe (*in his juſt vindication of the Church of England*, p. 101.) which witneſſes

neſſes that the *Greeks* departed from the then-Pope with theſe words, *Wee acknowledge thy power, we cannot ſatisfie your covetouſneſs, live by your ſelves.*

His ſecond doubt is, that *the Biſhop of Rome is not able to adminiſter that vaſt Province.* I wonder how he did of old; and why he may not do the ſame again as well as formerly. But the Dr. calls it a *politick probleme* whether hee can or no; and would have *it judged by theſe who are by God entruſted with the Flock. Id eſt* (ſaith he) *by the Princes, the nurſing Fathers in every Church.* It is indeed a *politick probleme*, that is, a *queſtion concerning Government*; but ſince it concernes *Government Eccleſiaſtical*, it falls not under the ſcanning of temporal *Politicians.* The Chriſtian Common-wealth would be brought to a preety paſs, if the Government of Gods Church, ſo long acknowledged as left by Chriſt, and continued in the Church 300. yeares (by their own confeſſion) ere there were any Chriſtian Princes, ſhould anew be call'd into queſtion by humane policy. But theſe two words of Scripture *Nurſing Fathers* make it plain to the Doctor (ſatisfy'd with any thing himſelf fancies) that the Government and Jurisdiction over the Church belongs to Kings; as if to *nurſe*, *cheriſh* and *foſter*, were to *rule*, *order*, *govern* and *command*; or, as if *Joſeph*, who was *Foſter-father* to our Saviour, was as good as, or the ſame with God Almighty, who was his true Father. And I wonder where this Doctor ever read, that our Saviour entruſted the Government of his Church and Eccleſiaſtical affaires to any but the Apoſtles, Eccleſiaſtical perſons; or that any held *Nero*, C. 8. Sect. 6

he Heathen Emperour, to have right and title o be *Head of the Church.*

Again, if our Saviour left that authority with his Apostles, I would gladly know, by what new Orders from *Christ*, it came to be transfer'd from their Successors into the hands of secular Princes. But the Doctor has by his former words brought the matter at length to a finall decision. The question is, whether it be fitting the Pope should rule over the whole Church, which none denies but a few *schismatical Princes*; he comes to take up the controversie, and tels us those very Princes (for all Catholike Princes have already determined the contrary) must decide the truth of the businesse. As if an Umpire, being to arbitrate a quarrel about the Authority of the Vice-chancellour of *Oxford*, opposed by the *Major*, his Competitor, should take up the businesse by saying it was a *politick probleme*, belonging to the Government of the Universitty, and so ought to bee decided by none but the *Major*.

SECT.

SECT. 2.

Of Dr. Hammonds *evaſion in recurring to the firſt* 300. *yeares, and concerning the* humble *and* docible *temper of his Church.*

HAving thus cleared the Proteſtants for renouncing the Rules of Faith; (which was part of his well-divided *Schiſm againſt mutual Charity* as far as it concernes *Faith*) he is come to treat next of the ſecond part of that firſt *ſpecies* of *mutual Charity*, which *concernes Faith*, to wit, of the *particular doctrines in Faith*: in which he ſayes *he doubts not but to approve himſelfe to any that will judge of the Apoſtolical Doctrines and Traditions by the Scriptures and conſent of the firſt* 300. *years, or the four General Councils*, &c. which is a very plauſible and pithy piece of ſhuffling, expreſſing a plain tergiverſation from *approving himſelfe* willing to do any thing, but to wave and ſhift the Queſtion. For firſt, *we muſt judge of Apoſtolical doctrines and Traditions by Scripture.* I ask, are thoſe doctrines clearer expreſt in Scripture than they are in the depoſitories of the Churches, by which he told us before they were brought down to us, or no? If they be clearer in *Scripture*, what needed we thoſe *depoſitives* at all, and to what end does that *Apoſtolical Providence* ſerve? If

not, how can we judge of them by *Scripture*, which speakes more obscurely of them? Again, since we must judge of *Apostolical* doctrines by *Scripture*, what rules does the Doctor give us to settle our judgement; when things are cleare in *Scripture* and when not? for we see many men, who govern themselves by *fancy*, think that *evident*, which another judges to have no apparence of truth. And, for my part, I even despair of bringing clearer proofes from *Scripture*, than that *S. Paul* converted *Jewes*, and *S. Peter Gentiles*; which yet you saw could give the nice Doctor no satisfaction.

Another tergiversation is his *standing onely to the first* 300. *yeares*; where the Authors being scarce, by reason of the Churches obscure state under persecution; and hardly any occasion to speak of the late-risen controversies between us, he hopes no great matter can be concluded against him thence, where scarce any thing is found that concernes our quarrel. As if, being to fight a Duel with an Adversary, he would stand to the appointment of no place and time, but onely in a wildernesse and a dark night; where they might be sure never to meet, or being met, never see one another. No better is his standing to the four first Councils onely; which were all call'd upon other occasions, and so touch not any point of debate between us, except onely on the by, and therefore obscurely; the best testimonies out of which have been already objected by him, and solved by us. But why onely foure? since all Councils are of equal Authority; there being nothing found to authorize the first foure, but

was found in the fifth, sixth, &c. So that this challenge of the Drs. is all one as if an *Arian* Heretick would be judged by no place in Scripture, whether Christ were God or no, but out of the *Proverbs of Solomon*; where nothing is found concerning that point; dilating much upon the praises of *Solomon*, and what a most *pure* and *uncorrupted* piece of Scripture that Book is; but producing no *Evidence* in the world why the other Books of *Scripture* were not as pure and sacred as it.

But the Doctor escapes not so; he has engag'd himselfe by this (as he thought) secure grant, further than he imagines. His allowing of foure Councils to examine his Faith by, is an acknowledgement that he admits the Authority of Councils as sacred and binding. He must either then shew *EVIDENCE* that the 5th Council erred, or that the Church and her Pastors had declined from the faith of the foregoing Age, or else he is obliged to accept it, and so the rest, under the penalty of forfeiting the title of a good Christian: for no lesse blot will fall to his share, who rejects an Authority held sacred by himselfe, without most clear Evidence of a just exception. As he who acknowledges the Authority of Parliament, by admitting the Acts of some as valid Lawes, is bound, by the very acknowledgment of some, to accept all the rest, unless an open *Evidence* convince their Votes not to have been free, or that there was some other known defect in the managing of them. Onely in this latter a far lesse Evidence will serve the turn, the Authority of Parliament being but humane, whereas the other was held and acknowledged to bee

sacred. But indeed, the truth is, hee accepts not even of those four, because he thinks Councils to be of Authority; but because he thinks there is no doctrine in these against his Fancy or Faith; or if any, he hopes he can make a shift to shuffle it off: In the mean time gaining a very great patronage and countenance to his cause, in pleading it relies on such highly authoriz'd supports.

C. 8. *S.* 7. No candider than the former is his evasion of being judged by the *purest Ages*; which in reality signifies onely such times wherein nothing was treated against those heresies which afterwards cling'd together to compound Protestantism. This is manifest by his admitting 300. *yeares next after Christ*, no more; by which he excludes the fourth and fifth Ages, yet at pleasure admits the fourth General Council held about the middle of the fifth Age. So that, the whole Church must be imagin'd to be first *pure*, then *impure*, afterwards *pure again*, according as the supposition of it suits best for the Doctors purpose. If none of their particular heresies were rife, and therefore not condemned in the first obsure 300. years, presently the Dr. cries up those Ages for *pure*; But the Church in the next Age, having now got rid of persecution, became pester'd with *home-bred factions and heresies*; which made the Fathers of the Church take pen in hand, vigorously confuting them and some of the Doctors *tenets* among the rest. Hereupon the Doctor presently decries that Age as *impure*, *popish*, *corrupted*. But then in the middle of the fifth age was call'd a Council, which chanced to treat nothing professedly of the errours afterwards embraced

embraced by the Protestants; nay more, had a certain passage in it (which I have before cleared) serving them to blunder in against the Pope; Immediately that Council was sacred, and that age (or at least that year) was *pure* again. For it cannot be imagin'd the doctrine of that Council was *pure*, but the beleefe of the Faithful in that Age taught by those Pastors which there resided must be *pure* also. Far more consonant then to their grounds is the doctrine of the *Puritans*, denying promiscuously all Antiquity; than to pick and cull out at pleasure what serves their turn (as doe the *Protestants*) and to like and reject, allow and disallow what makes for or against them, without giving any evident reason, why they put such a difference.

In vain therefore does the Doctor (like a very Saint) pretend in behalfe of their Church *an unaffected ignorance though they should mistake*, being conscious to himselfe what pitiful shifts he makes use of in stead of grounds. In vain does he hope that this *rulinesse* (as he calls it) *and obedience of theirs* will render them approvable to God; unless they can render God an approved reason, why they will at pleasure hold his sacred Spouse, the Church, holy in one Age and adulterate in another; and shape and fashion Christs *seamless coat*, according to the mode of their ever-changing fancy. Lastly, most vainly doe they hop: *this rulinesse in holding to the first* 300. *yeares will lead them into all truth*, unless they could shew that all the points of Truth between them and us were professedly treated and decided in those times, and the decision on their side.

He

grounds, that is, in believing the Church' *infallible*; yet they cannot be condemned for proceeding inconsequently upon those ground: for an *infallible Authority* deserves a firm assent. But to stand to the acceptation of matters of Faith, which you pretend *most certain*, upon an Authority confessed by your selves *uncertain*, is such a condiscension of *humility*, such a prostrating your proper knowledge, as is not onely a blindly-captivating your Judgment, but even an utter renouncing all judgment, prudence and common sence; not a submitting the reason by a voluntary winking at objections, but a quite extinguishing and perfect putting out of the very Eye of reason it selfe; and is all one as if a man should say, *For any thing I know, such a one may lye in what he tells mee; yet nevertheless I will strongly perswade my selfe that all hee sayes is most certainely true.*

C. 8. Sect. 8 Yet this *humility* the Doctor calls here *a special mark of the Church of Englands Reformation*. And surely you have reformed well; since you have not only reform'd the *Unity* you before enjoy'd, into distractions; the *Faith* you formerly profest into new-fangled *misbeleefes*: but your former *reason* and *judgment* into present *folly* and *fancy*. What is said of your accepting the *four Councils*, &c. may also bee apply'd to your *private interpretations of Scripture*, which found your *Faith*; which *Faith* you will have to be certain and firm, though the persons Interpretation it is built on, be *fallible* and obnoxious to errour. The pious words in your own behalfe with which you close up your Chapter, spoken in an *Elegi-*

ack tone, are very moanfully moving words out of a pulpit; rhetorical enough for women, not rational enough to satisfie any prudent man. You profesie you *would preserve the Vnity of the Apostolical Faith and primitive practises, as entire as Christs body or garments.* Good Mr. *Hammond*, leave mocking your Readers; and tell us why the Primitive times must needs just end then, when the Church began to flourish, and the Fathers to write against your doctrine. And as for *Christs body or garments*, I see no such great respect in you or your Churches doctrine allow'd towards holy Reliques, that I should be willing to trust those sacred pledges to your unhallowed hands; from whose rude usage his *mystical Body*, his Church, Faith (its Rule) Sacraments, Government, nor any thing, though never so sacred, left by our Saviour, hath found any security.

SECT. 3.

An examination of some common notes produced by Dr. Hammond, *to particularize his Clients to bee no Schismaticks.*

HIs 9th Ch. undertakes to clear his Church from the 2d. sort of his *Schism against mutual charity*, to wit, from that Schism which is against

self your by testimonies out of the following ages, unles you wil disavow your own grounds; for those ages were (as you say) *all impure*. Lay your hand then on your heart, Mr. *Hammond*, and tell us in good sadness, if you be not gravell'd in your own doctrine, while you maintain this new Lay-Ecclesiastical Government.

C. 9. S. 1. His second plea is, that, *as they maintain the Order of Bishops, so they submit to the exercise of it, acknowledging the Authority of those Governors.* In answer to which, no new thing is to be said, this being the very same with the former; only *First* changed into *Secondly*. For, the obeying, submitting to, and acknowledging the due Authority of Governours, is the very formal maintaining and accepting the Government, which was his first branch. So as this is another orderly production of the Drs. methodical Head, which vents it self in *first*, *secondly*, *thirdly*, &c. upon all occasions, though both his *first*, *second*, and *third* bee the self-same formal thing.

Ibid. His third plea is, that they observe the circumstances necessary to the assembling themselves for publick worship. *First*, that of place (*Churches.*) *Secondly*, that of time (the *Lords day*, *primitive Festivals.*) As if all Schismaticks in the World doe not meet at some set times, and in some appointed and set places. *Thirdly*, *Formes of prayer and praises* (almost all out of our *Mass* and *Breviary.*) *Celebration of Sacraments* (onely five of them being quite abolish't, and three quarters of the sixth.) *Sacramentals*, Copes and Surplisses, which you might by the same principles, call rags of *Rome*.

Preaching

Preaching (against Christ and his Church; such doctrine as none ever sent you or your first Fore-fathers to preach.) *Cathechising* (infecting and imbuing tender and ease minds with your tainted doctrine, *Fourthly, that of Ceremonies, such as the practice of the Primitive Church hath sent down recommended to us.* Pray, by whom did she send them down and recommend them to you? Examine wel, and you shall find that the same authority recommended to you many more, as from her, though you only accepted of what you thought convenient. *Lastly, that of discipline to binde all to these performances.* Doubtlesse all Sects in the world impose some obligation upon their subjects to keep them together, else they could not bee a Sect. Yet that your tie, either to that, or any thing else concerning *Government*, is as slack as may be, is manifest out of the slender provision made against Schism according to the Protestant grounds, See *Part* 3. *Sect.* 1. as I have shewn in my answer to the fore-going Chapter. Neither are you beholding to your doctrine for any discipline sufficient to hold you together in Unity, (a professed fallibility is too weak for that) but to the *secular Power*; the threat of whose sword held you in awe for a while; but as soon as that Power was dissolv'd, your slack-sinew'd Church, which no tie either in Reason or Conscience held together, bewrayed its composition, and like the statue seen by *Nabuchadonosor*, fell all to pieces.

It were not amiss ere I leave these three pleas, already mentioned, to take a second survey of them, that the Reader may visibly

perceive how less than nothing this Doctor hath said, either to his, or indeed any purpose. To make this discovery sincere, we must mark his intent and scope in this Chapter, which is to free or clear their Church from the *breach of Communion Ecclesiastical*, which he makes to consist in such and such things. Now a man that goes about to clear another of an imputed fault, should (as I conceive) propose the objected fault with the presumptions of the defendants guiltiness: and then *diluere objecta*, wipe off the stain of the accusations, and clear his innocencie. What does the Dr? he takes no notice of what is objected; but in stead of that, onely reckons up some few indifferent things which their Church hath not rejected (and sure it were a hard case if they had rejected all which their Forefathers taught them) and then thinks the deed done. In particular, he tells us first that they retain the Government of Bishops; but why they have innovated a new Church-government, making the King Head in Ecclesiastical matters; or why they obey those Bishops, who can derive their *mission of doctrine* from no former Church or Authority; which only are the things objected to them, as *schism*; of these two points hee sayes nothing That they now obey their *Bishops* he tells us, but why they obey'd not him, or why they *cast out his Authority*, whom they held before to bee the *Chief-Bishop*, that's a matter not worth clearing. The Pope's Antichrist, and ther's an end.

Then he clears his side from Schism, because they assemble in Churches: but he never considers that wee charge them with plain Sacri-

ledge

ledge for meeting there, and detaining those places (anciently ours, and built by us) out of the true owners hands, and applying them to prophane uses: All that with him, is very laudable, and needs no clearing either from injustice, or sacriledge. He clears their Church of *Schism*, because they observe yet *some Festivals* (and the like may bee said of *Sacramentals* and *Ceremonies*) but considers not that the *schism* consists in this, that they, at their own voluntary pleasure, refusing some, and admitting others, denied consequently obedience to that Authority which recommended *both* unto them; and which disobedience their own grounds condemnes, as shall presently bee shewed.

He cleares his Church of *Schism*, by alledging they observe some *form of Prayer*: but never takes notice that the crime wee object to them is this, that they ruin'd Religious houses to build dwelling Halls; so they mangled our Holy and ancient Service-books to patch up their reformed piece of the book of *Common-prayer*; leaving out all the most sacred parts of it, to wit, *Canon Missæ*, and what ever concerned the Heaven-propitiating Sacrifice, that highest and soul-elevating Act of Religion; and onely taking out of it those sleighter things which might satisfie the lower-siz'd devotion of *their reformed spirits*, and was enough to serve them to cry, *Lord, Lord.*

He brings, as a proofe of their innocencie from *schism*, that they have *celebration of Sacraments, Preaching and Catechizing*, &c. But thinks it not worth clearing, that of seven

Sacraments they have retain'd onely the substance of one, and the shadow of another. Nor ever considers whether their doctrine be true or false. All is one for that with the Doctor; if they doe but *preach, pray, and catechise*, let it be what it will, it is a certain note that they are *no schismaticks.*

Lastly, hee puts as an argument to cleare them from *schism*, that they have some *Discipline to bind to these performances*, &c. (that is, they use some little wit or meanes to maintain their schism, and hold their tribe together;) but he waves that for which onely we accuse them of *Schism*; to wit, that they utterly renounced all the discipline, and even all ground of it, in that Church, of which theirs was once a member, and fancied to themselves a new one, without any ground of Authority, and with direct opposition and contempt of the former *discipline.*

Nor hath he onely, in this present endeavour to clear his Church of *Schism*, omitted the very mentioning those matters which were to be cleared, but even the things he alledges, as whose retaining, hee makes account frees their Church from *schism*, are such pitifull ordinary businesses, so indifferent to all or most schismaticks and hereticks, that they can no way particularize them to be none, or exempt them from the common crue of their fellowes. For what *schism* ever arose, but had some kind of government or discipline, had their meetings in some *set places*, at some *set times*, pray'd in their own new way, *preach't*, *taught and catechiz'd* their own doctrine. So as the Doctor might with far better Logick have concluded

the

the Protestants no *schismaticks*, because they have all noses on their faces; this being common to Catholikes as well as Schismaticks; and so might seem partly to excuse them: whereas the other, of admitting such points and no more (which are the Doctors notes of his Church) are disclaimed by all Catholikes, and common to almost all Schismaticks. Nay some schismaticks and hereticks have retained much more of what their Ancestors taught them, as *Lutherans*; some almost all points, as the *Greeks* and the old *Arians*; the latter of which (excepting their one heresie against Christs divinity) had twenty times more markes of a Church in all other things, than the Drs could ever pretend to.

Fourthly, hee assures us, that the Popes Authority is an *usurpation*, and *the use of more ceremonies and Festivals an imposition of the Romanists.* How so Mr. Doctor? if the Supremacy of the *Bishop of Rome* was brought in 900. yeares agoe, when Pope *Gregory* sent to convert our Forefathers to Christs faith, as your selfe and your followers grant, then how is it *an usurpation* of the *present Romanists*? Were wee, who now live, alive 900. yeares agoe? or are they who lived 900. years ago, alive now? But in regard you onely say it, and bring no proof, I shall not trouble my self in vouchsafing you an answer. As for the imposition of more ceremonies, which you say the present Romanists used towards you, without any authority from the *Primitive Church*, it is so silly, so contrary both to our grounds and your owa alio, that you make your selfe ridiculous to any man that understands either C. 9. S. 2.

C. 8. *Sect.* 8. He ends in a preaching manner with extolling the *humble and docible temper of his Church.* Truly, Mr. Doctor, it is a wonderful commendation to your Church that she is yet *to bee taught:* Pray, when will she be at age to leave going to School? when will she be out of her *prentice-like tutorage*, and set up for her selfe to *professe truth*, as a *Church* should do? I thought a *Church* should have been *Columna & firmamentum veritatis*; *the Pillar and firm foundation of Truth*; but yours is like the hinge of a door, or a weather-cock, *docibly* turning *with every wind of doctrine.* How doe you think the Puritans or any other Sect should in reason yeeld any Authority to your Church, since she professes her selfe yet learning her Faith; that is, as yet knowes it not? If it be such a commendation in your Church to be *docible*, I suppose it is so in others, and consequently in the whole Church; and then, I pray, who must teach her, or what greater Professor is there on Earth of the knowledge of Christs Faith, to whom the Universal Church may submit her selfe as *docible?* Perhaps you will say that one particular Church must sisterly and charitably assist and teach another; that is, though each be ignorant in selfe, yet (like the blind leading the blind) they must all be supposed mutual Mistresses, and consequently all learned.

But let us examine a little further this *docible and humble temper of your* youngling *Church.* Is it *docibleness* or *humility* think you, to forsake a Mistress, who had all the qualities which could give her Authority, and fall to teach your selves new reformed doctrines without

aut

any Authority at all? Such is the *humble docibleneſſe of your Church.* Is it *docibleneſs* to caſt off the Authority of 14. General Councils, and the conſent of *Chriſtendome* for twelve hundred yeares, and rely upon your own judgments to interpret the reſt as you liſt? This is the ſo much-brag'd on *docibleneſs* and *humble temper* of your Church.

Parallel to the former, or rather far outvying them (though of a contrary ſtrain) is that moſt heroick Act of your *docible humility* to be willing to hold things concerning your eternal ſalvation upon the Authority of the four General Councils, or the Doctors and Church of the firſt 300. yeares; which Drs. and Councils notwithſtanding it is an Article of your Faith that they are *fallible*: And as for the Church of thoſe times, that it was *fallible* your ſelfe grants; for you confeſſe that the ſame Church erred in the fourth Age. Now, to hold Articles or points of Faith upon that Authority, which it is an Article of Faith may deceive me, is ſuch a magnanimous piece of *docible humility*, as I dare be bold to ſay, in the Doctors behalfe, neither the Apoſtles nor any Saint in the ſucceeding Church durſt ever own. Neither can the preſent Catholikes, whom ſome (who neither underſtand their own, nor Catholike grounds) laugh at, as blindly humble and obedient to the Church, lay claim to ſuch an incomparable degree of *humility*, proper and peculiar to the Proteſtants onely. For we pretend not *Faith* certain, but upon a deemed *INFALLIBILITY* in the Authority aſſuring it; ſo as, though they may be ſuppoſed blameable by you for failing in their

C. 8. *S.* 7.

See the 21 *Art. of the Church of* England.

grounds, that is, in believing the Church *infallible*; yet they cannot be condemned for proceeding inconsequently upon those grounds; for an *infallible Authority* deserves a firm assent. But to stand to the acceptation of matters of Faith, which you pretend *most certain*, upon an Authority confessed by your selves *uncertain*, is such a condiscension of *humility*, such a prostrating your proper knowledge, as is not onely a blindly-captivating your Judgment, but even an utter renouncing all judgment, prudence and common sence; not a submitting the reason by a voluntary winking at objections, but a quite extinguishing and perfect putting out of the very Eye of reason it selfe; and is all one as if a man should say, *For any thing I know, such a one may lye in what he tells mee; yet nevertheless I will strongly perswade my selfe that all hee sayes is most certainely true.*

C. 8. Sect. 8 Yet this *humility* the Doctor calls here a *special mark of the Church of Englands Reformation*. And surely you have reformed well; since you have not only reform'd the *Unity* you before enjoy'd, into distractions; the *Faith* you formerly profest into new-fangled *misbeleefes*: but your former *reason* and *judgment* into present *folly* and *fancy*. What is said of your accepting the *four Councils*, &c. may also bee apply'd to your *private interpretations of Scripture*, which found your *Faith*; which *Faith* you will have to be certain and firm, though the persons Interpretation it is built on, be *fallible* and obnoxious to errour. The pious words in your own behalfe with which you close up your Chapter, spoken in an *Elegi-*

ack tone, are very moanfully moving words out of a pulpit; rhetorical enough for women, not rational enough to satisfie any prudent man. You profesie you *would preserve the Vnity of the Apostolical Faith and primitive practises, as entire as Christs body or garments.* Good Mr. *Hammond*, leave mocking your Readers; and tell us why the Primitive times must needs just end then, when the Church began to flourish, and the Fathers to write against your doctrine. And as for *Christs body or garments*, I see no such great respect in you or your Churches doctrine allow'd towards holy Reliques, that I should be willing to trust those sacred pledges to your unhallowed hands; from whose rude usage his *mystical Body*, his Church, Faith (its Rule) Sacraments, Government, nor any thing, though never so sacred, left by our Saviour, hath found any security.

SECT. 3.

An examination of some common notes produced by Dr. Hammond, *to particularize his Clients to bee no Schismaticks.*

HIs 9th Ch. undertakes to clear his Church from the 2d. sort of his *Schism against mutual charity*, to wit, from that Schism which is against

gainst *extern Peace*, or *Communion Ecclesiastical.*

And first, he alledges for his plea, that they have retain'd the right form of *Government*, &c. So that now, *Schism* against *Subordination* or *Government* (for they are all one) which was the first general Head of *Schism*, and also comprehended under the first species of the second *Head*, as appeares *C.* 8. *S.* 2. is by the Doctors accurate method come to be under the second species also of the same second General Head. Which is all one, as if dividing *vivens* into *Sensitive* and *Insensitive*, and then subdividing the *Genus* of *Sensitive* into the two *Species* of *Rational* and *Irrational*, or *Man* and *Beast*; he should first treat of *Insensitive*, the first *Genus*, and (that done) fall in hand with *Sensitive*, the second; and then, under each *Species* of that, returne to treat professedly of *Insensitive* again; that is, to speak of Trees, Shrubs, and Herbs, when he should speak of men and creatures endued with sence. Surely Doctor *Hammond* is more methodical in his Sermons; otherwise, the World must needs look upon him as another S. *John Baptist*, because hee preaches in a Wilderness.

C. 9. *Sect.* 5

But let us follow him through all his Mazes, distinguish't by no orderly path, but what his own inconstant and desultorious track makes. First then he tells us that they *retain the Form of Government, in and under which the Apostles founded Ecclesiastical Assemblies* or *Communion*, viz. *that of the Bishop and his inferior Officers in every Church.* As if the *Arian* Hereticks, who denied Christ to be God, and a mo

most all heresies that ever broke from Gods Church, did not retain afterwards the Authority of their own Bishops. But what availed it either them or you, but to the greater danger of damnation; if you adhered to those Bishops, who had rejected the Authority of their former Superiours, and taught you doctrines contrary to the Order of Gods Church; without whose order, much lesse against it, they had no Authority to teach at all?

Again, you tell us of one piece of your Government (that of Bishops) *constituted* indeed by the Apostles; but you tell us nor of the main hinge of your Churches Government, which is, of the King being its *Head and Supreme in Ecclesiastical matters*. This is the sum and top of your Churches Government, put us not off with an odd end of it. This is that, for substituting which, in stead of the Ecclesiastical Head you rejected, wee charge you of *Schism* and breach of *Communion Ecclesiastical*: for in so doing you cut Gods Church into as many single-headed, and consequently diverse-bodied and *disparate* Congregations, as there are Kingdoms in *Christendome*. Shew us that this your Novelty in Government was *practised by the Apostles in their Assemblies*, or instituted by them or their Blessed Master, and then you will say something to the point. Remember your *purest times of the first 300. yeares*; shew us that all that time the Church was ordered by the Emperours Presidency, or that this Government was instituted by Christ and his Apostles: If you cannot, then tell us, how comes it to be held now as a chief point of Faith? You may not in reason think to uphold

your

selfe your by testimonies out of the following ages, unles you wil disavow your own grounds; for those ages were (as you say) *all impure.* Lay your hand then on your heart, Mr. *Hammond*, and tell us in good sadness, if you be not gravell'd in your own doctrine, while you maintain this new Lay-Ecclesiasticall Government.

C. 9. S. 1. His second plea is, that, *as they maintain the Order of Bishops, so they submit to the exercise of it, acknowledging the Authority of those Governors,* In answer to which, no new thing is to be said, this being the very same with the former; only *First* changed into *Secondly.* For, the obeying, submitting to, and acknowledging the due Authority of Governours, is the very formal maintaining and accepting the Government, which was his first branch. So as this is another orderly production of the Drs. methodical Head, which vents it selfe in *first, secondly, thirdly,* &c. upon all occasions, though both his *first, second,* and *third* bee the selfe-same formal thing.

Ibid. His third plea is, that they observe the circumstances necessary to the assembling themselves for publick worship. *First*, that of place (*Churches.*) *Secondly*, that of time (the *Lords day, primitive Festivals.*) As if all Schismaticks in the World doe not meet at some set times, and in some appointed and set places. *Thirdly, Formes of prayer and praises* (almost all out of our *Mass* and *Breviary.*) *Celebration of Sacraments* (onely five of them being quite abolish't, and three quarters of the sixth.) *Sacramentals*, Copes and Surplisses, which you might by the same principles, call rags of *Rome.*

Preaching

Preaching (againſt Chriſt and his Church; ſuch doctrine as none ever ſent you or your firſt Fore-fathers to preach.) *Cathechiſing* (infecting and imbuing tender and eaſie minds with your tainted doctrine, *Fourthly, that of Ceremonies, ſuch as the practice of the Primitive Church hath ſent down recommended to us.* Pray, by whom did ſhe ſend them down and recommend them to you? Examine wel, and you ſhall find that the ſame authority recommended to you many more, as from her, though you only accepted of what you thought convenient. *Laſtly, that of diſcipline to binde all to theſe performances.* Doubtleſſe all Sects in the world impoſe ſome obligation upon their ſubjects to keep them together, elſe they could not bee a Sect. Yet that your tie, either to that, or any thing elſe concerning *Government*, is as ſlack as may be, is manifeſt out of the ſlender proviſion made againſt Schiſm according to the Proteſtant grounds, See *Part* 3. *Sect.* 1. as I have ſhewn in my anſwer to the fore-going Chapter. Neither are you beholding to your doctrine for any diſcipline ſufficient to hold you together in Unity, (a profeſſed fallibility is too weak for that) but to the *ſecular Power*; the threat of whoſe ſword held you in awe for a while; but as ſoon as that Power was diſſolv'd, your ſlack-ſinew'd Church, which no tie either in Reaſon or Conſcience held together, bewrayed its compoſition, and like the ſtatue ſeen by *Nabuchadonoſor*, fell all to pieces.

It were not amiſs ere I leave theſe three pleas, already mentioned, to take a ſecond ſurvey of them, that the Reader may viſibly

perceive how less than nothing this Doctor hath said, either to his, or indeed any purpose. To make this discovery sincere, we must mark his intent and scope in this Chapter, which is to free or clear their Church from the *breach of Communion Ecclesiastical*, which he makes to consist in such and such things. Now a man that goes about to clear another of an imputed fault, should (as I conceive) propose the objected fault with the presumptions of the defendants guiltiness: and then *diluere objecta*, wipe off the staine of the accusations, and clear his innocencie. What does the Dr? he takes no notice of what is objected; but in stead of that, onely reckons up some few indifferent things which their Church hath not rejected (and sure it were a hard case if they had rejected all which their Forefathers taught them) and then thinks the deed done. In particular, he tells us first that they retain the Government of Bishops; but why they have innovated a new Church-government, making the King Head in Ecclesiastical matters; or why they obey those Bishops, who can derive their *mission of doctrine* from no former Church or Authority; which only are the things objected to them, as *schism*; of these two points hee sayes nothing That they now obey their *Bishops* he tells us, but why they obey'd not him, or why they *cast out his Authority*, whom they held before to bee the *Chief-Bishop*, that's a matter not worth clearing. The Pope's Antichrist, and ther's an end.

Then he clears his side from Schism, because they assemble in Churches: but he never considers that wee charge them with plain Sacri-

ledge

ledge for meeting there, and detaining thoſe places (anciently ours, and built by us) out of the true owners hands, and applying them to prophane uſes: All that with him, is very laudable, and needs no clearing either from injuſtice, or ſacriledge. He clears their Church of *Schiſm*, becauſe they obſerve yet *ſome Feſtivals* (and the like may bee ſaid of *Sacramentals* and *Ceremonies*) but conſiders not that the *ſchiſm* conſiſts in this, that they, at their own voluntary pleaſure, refuſing ſome, and admitting others, denied conſequently obedience to that Authority which recommended *both* unto them; and which diſobedience their own grounds condemnes, as ſhall preſently bee ſhewed.

He cleares his Church of *Schiſm*, by alledging they obſerve ſome *form of Prayer*: but never takes notice that the crime wee object to them is this, that they ruin'd Religious houſes to build dwelling Halls; ſo they mangled our Holy and ancient Service-books to patch up their reformed piece of the book of *Common-prayer*; leaving out all the moſt ſacred parts of it, to wit, *Canon Miſſæ*, and what ever concerned the Heaven-propitiating Sacrifice, that higheſt and ſoul-elevating Act of Religion; and onely taking out of it thoſe ſleighter things which might ſatisfie the lower-ſiz'd devotion of *their reformed ſpirits*, and was enough to ſerve them to cry, *Lord, Lord.*

He brings, as a proofe of their innocencie from *ſchiſm*, that they have *celebration of Sacraments, Preaching and Catechizing*, &c. But thinks it not worth clearing, that of ſeven

Sacraments they have retain'd onely the substance of one, and the shadow of another. Nor ever considers whether their doctrine be true or false. All is one for that with the Doctor; if they doe but *preach, pray, and catechise*, let it be what it will, it is a certain note that they are *no schismaticks*.

Lastly, hee puts as an argument to cleare them from *schism*, that they have some *Discipline to bind to these performances*, &c. (that is, they use some little wit or meanes to maintain their schism, and hold their tribe together;) but he waves that for which onely we accuse them of *Schism*; to wit, that they utterly renounced all the discipline, and even all ground of it, in that Church, of which theirs was once a member, and fancied to themselves a new one, without any ground of Authority, and with direct opposition and contempt of the former *discipline*.

Nor hath he onely, in this present endeavour to clear his Church of *Schism*, omitted the very mentioning those matters which were to be cleared, but even the things he alledges, as whose retaining, hee makes account frees their Church from *schism*, are such pitifull ordinary businesses, so indifferent to all or most schismaticks and hereticks, that they can no way particularize them to be none, or exempt them from the common crue of their fellowes. For what *schism* ever arose, but had some kind of government or discipline, had their meetings in some *set places*, at some *set times*, pray'd in their own new way, *preach't*, *taught and catechiz'd* their own doctrine. So as the Doctor might with far better Logick have concluded the

the Protestants no *schismaticks*, because they have all noses on their faces; this being common to Catholikes as well as Schismaticks; and so might seem partly to excuse them: whereas the other, of admitting such points and no more (which are the Doctors notes of his Church) are disclaimed by all Catholikes, and common to almost all Schismaticks. Nay some schismaticks and hereticks have retained much more of what their Ancestors taught them, as *Lutherans*; some almost all points, as the *Greeks* and the old *Arians*; the latter of which (excepting their one heresie against Christs divinity) had twenty times more markes of a Church in all other things, than the Drs could ever pretend to.

Fourthly, hee assures us, that the Popes Authority is an *usurpation*, and *the use of more ceremonies and Festivals an imposition of the Romanists.* How so Mr. Doctor? if the Supremacy of the *Bishop of Rome* was brought in 900. yeares agoe, when Pope *Gregory* sent to convert our Forefathers to Christs faith, as your selfe and your followers grant, then how is it *an usurpation* of the *present Romanists*? Were wee, who now live, alive 900. yeares agoe? or are they who lived 900. years ago, alive now? But in regard you onely say it, and bring no proof, I shall not trouble my self in vouchsafing you an answer. As for the imposition of more ceremonies, which you say the present Romanists used towards you, without any authority from the *Primitive Church*, it is so silly, so contrary both to our grounds and your owne also, that you make your selfe ridiculous to any man that understands either C. 9. S. 2.

one or the other. For since the institution of *Ceremonies* is one of the ἀδιαφορα, or *things indifferent*, left to the ordering of Gods Church, as both the 20th *Article* of the new English Creed expressely determines, and all moderate Protestants hold, I wonder why our Church should not, when she saw convenient, ordain new *Ceremonies* (and the like may bee said of new *Festivals*, which are things indifferent also) and recommend the observation and practice of them to you, who were then members of that Church, her subjects and children. Most lawfully then did our Church, (even in your own grounds) in impoſing *new Ceremonies* on you, her then-subjects; and, if so, as unlawfully did you in spurning against her Ordinances. Neither consequently, can those few you retain upon your own head (and not her Authority) excuse you from *Schism*.

Equally absurd is your zealous profession of conforming your selves in ceremonies to the *Primitive times*; for if the Church hath Authority upon emergent conveniences and difficulties to institute new Ceremonies and alter old ones; then, you must either grant our Church in the fifteenth age to have been no Church (which you dare not affirm for fear of spoiling your own *mission*) or else grant that you were more bound to hold the Ceremonies recommended by her, than those which descended from the *Primitive times*; Since our Church could better see what was expedient for her present circumstances, than the Primitive could foresee so long before hand, what was likely to be convenient for future ages.

SECT.

SECT. 4.

Of Doctor Hammonds *charitableneſſe in admitting all to his Communion, and our pretended Uncharitableneſſe for refuſing to goe to their Aſſemblies.*

IN the fifth place the Doctor profeſſes, like a good charitable man as hee is; that *they exclude no Chriſtian from their Communion, that will either filially or fraternally embrace it with them.* No truly, to give your Religion its due, it is a wonderful civil and courteous profeſſion, and admits all the old condemned Hereſies into *Communion*, provided they but profeſſe *Chriſt*; whatever points elſe they deny, it matters not. Nay it is ſufficient, if they call themſelves *Chriſtians* (though all the world elſe calls them *Hereticks*) yet your kind-hearted Church cannot but friendly entertain them. You keep open houſe for all commers. The doctrine of *Oportet hæreſes eſſe*, *There muſt bee hereſies*, is changed by your boon behaviour into *It is impoſſible there ſhould be hereſies*. For whereas the world heretofore underſtood thoſe to be *Hereticks*, who held the letter of the *Scripture*, and ſome points of Chriſtianity, but deny'd others, which were the *tenets* of the Univerſal Church at that time; you have now quite chang'd the former notion; and think *none to bee excluded*

from Communion, that is, none to be *Hereticks* that bear the name of a *Christian*; so as though they deny all points of *Christs* doctrine, yet professe *Christs* name, and the outward letter of the Scripture, let them come, and welcome. *Anabaptists*, *Brownists*, *Presbyterians*, *Quakers*, *Carpocratians*, perhaps *Arians*; nay even *Simon Magus* himself; all these sew'd together only with the aiery sound of the word, *Christian*, will serve for broken-ware pieces to patch up Doctor *Hammonds* motley Church. For since they hold to his grounds, that is, to professe *Christs* name, and the letter of the Scripture, he cannot in any reason admit some, and refuse the rest.

Again, the Doctor is willing to admit any that will *filially* or *fraternally* embrace communion with them, that is, all that will be either *under* them, or at least not *above* them; but is loath to admit communion with any that will *paternally* communicate with them, that is, be over and govern them: No, take heed of that; as much courtesie as you please, but not a dram of *humility*, *obedience*, nor *subjection* to *Superiours*: These peace-preserving virtues would quite break the neck of *Schism* and *Faction*. If there bee any such over-powering Authority, though never so long setled in possession over the Countrey, and acknowledged and beleeved by all Christians, in never so many ages, to bee of divine institution, yet presently the spirit of *Schism*, in the first place, endeavours to *break asunder the bonds* of this *paternal communion*; to pluck it *down to the ground*, and *cast it out of the Island*.

You are willing (you say) to *admit all to*

your

your Assemblies that acknowledge the foundation laid by Christ and his Apostles. You love mightily to talk plausible words in the aire, and in general, as if you made account your Readers should bee all fooles, to search no further than the empty sound of your universal sayings, not applying them to the thing in question. Good Mr. Doctor, tell me what it is *to acknowledge the foundation laid by Christ and his Apostles?* Is it *to acknowledge Scripture?* All heresies in the world fly onely to it, and make it their armourhouse to oppugn Christ and his Church. *Arians* and *Socinians* most of all, and yet they can deny Christs Godhead: So as by this means indeed, you will have store of communicants. Is it the true sence of the Scripture? then *truth* being one, and falshood manifold, if their interpretation be different from yours, both cannot bee true, and consequently both acknowledge not the foundation left by Christ: for, falsifying his word, cannot be that foundation. Again, if this bee the foundation left by Christ; you must have some *certain* and *known Rule* to come by the true sence of the Scriptures; else you cannot be certainly assured who acknowledge this foundation, and so admit rashly to your Communion you know not whom. Is it perhaps the true sence of Scripture, but restrain'd to fundamentals? still the same difficulty remaines, unlesse you have some certain Rule to distinguish and sort out the Essentials from points of less importance; to talk much of fundamentals, and never tell us which are they, is but a shuffling trick of a mountebank, and very unbecomming a grave Divine. Or is this *Foundation* perhaps the solid sence of

Christs

Christs law *written and planted in the tables of mens hearts by the Apostles, and thence by a well-link't chain of Universal Tradition derived to our times?* If so, you must admit onely Catholikes, and exclude all the rest; since onely they hold this foundation. Or rather indeed, since you deny this way of bringing down Faith to bee sufficient, which Catholikes hold as a certain and infallible Rule, it followes, that if you will goe consequently to your own grounds, you must not admit them neither, since this is not the by-you acknowledged foundation laid by Christ and his Apostles. It remaines then that you are *willing to admit* all those, that shall *say they have the Foundation laid by Christ and his Apostles*; and then you cannot doubt but to have the brotherly fellowship of all hereticks and schismaticks in the world, that have been, are, or shall bee; since all pretend strongly in general termes to *acknowledge that Foundation.*

C.9. S.6. Nor is hee lesse devoutly charitable in the following words, that *they earnestly desire to bee admitted to the like freedome of external Communion with all the members of all other Christian Churches, as oft as occasion makes us capable of that blessing of the one heart and the one lip.* This it is to bee so inured to a drowsy sounding vein of preaching *Quodlibets*, till a man hath humm'd and drumm'd away all reason out of his head. Speak sence, man; and let your pretended Charity come clad in Truth, or else I must justly suspect it to bee nothing but Pharisaical hypocrisie. I hate contradictions, though told me in never so pious a tone. Was it ever heard that any Catholike deny'd you Communion, if

if you were capable of that blessing of *one heart* (the same interiour beleefe) and *one lip* (the same exteriour profession.) To what purpose then are those seemingly-pious words produc'd. Leave off paying us with this hollow language, empty of sence; render your selves capable of that blessing in your actions; renounce and repent your disobedience to your so-long-acknowledg'd Superiours: Repeal your schismatical ordinances against Christs Church: Re-acknowledge a certainty in Faith, which is now brought, by your professed uncertainty, to the very brink of Atheism; Return to the never-erring Rule of Faith, the voice of the Church, which held you for eight or nine hundred yeares in the firm and undivided Unity of the same beleef. Doe, I say, this efficaciously, and then you shall be freely, cordially, and with open armes received into Communion by them; who would willingly (though they lovingly reprehend you, to make you reflect on your errours) not onely spend empty words, but even lay down their lives to procure your salvation.

Sixthly, the Doctor charges us, that the *only hindrances which obstruct external Communion, are wholly imputable to us*: which hee proves first: *because the Pope excommunicated all those Catholikes that went to the Protestant Assemblies in the tenth year of Queen* Elizabeth. And was it not well done think you? This has ever been the constant practice of Gods Church, to enjoyn the Faithful to abstain from the Communion of those, who maintained a different, that is, an *heretical doctrine*. The simpler sort of Catholikes were gull'd by you to beleeve you had C. 9. S. 4.

had onely turn'd into *English* what was in *Latine* before, and therefore out of an unwarinesse, went to your Churches, which lately had been theirs; and not out of love to your new reformed doctrine: Till at length, the Father of the Church thought fit to disabuse them from the errour into which your false perswasions had led them; and forbid them the *same room*, who were not of the *same company*. And I wonder how it can stand with reason or sence, that, holding you hereticks, we should let the poore people goe to your Assemblies, to bee taught *false doctrine*; Nay even Nature it selfe seems to interdict such an unnatural commerce; that Catholikes, who held the Bishop of *Rome*'s Supremacy of Divine Institution; Mass, and the rest of our doctrines, from which you receded, *sacred*, should goe to your Congregations, to hear the first rail'd against, as *Antichristian*; the second, as *Idolatrous* and a *blasphemous fiction*; the rest, as erroneous and pernicious deceits. Blame not then, Mr. *Hammond*, Nature, Reason, and the Pope, for hindering this confusion, which you call *external Communion*; but rather blame your selves for introducing new doctrines, whence result such incompossible and inconsistent practices.

C. 9. S. 5. Yet the Doctor tells us, that from this prohibition, proceeding from the Popes Excommunication, *it is visibly consequent, that they were cast out, and cannot be said to separate.* Sure it must bee a temper of shame above brazen, to tell us this now in the tenth year of Queen *Elizabeth*; whereas himself hath laid out knot by knot how the Unity of the Church, in which they were formerly, was unloosed, or rather

rather violently broken, in the time of King *Henry* the eighth, King *Edwards* Protectour, and all the first ten yeares of this Queen. To which, though enough, and more then enough has been said, yet I will once more presse it home to the Dr. and then leave him to his wordish shifts, and the Reader to be his Judge. You and your King also were once members of the Roman Catholike Church, and subject to the Authority of the Pope; This Authority you confess (*C. 7. S. 5.*) *you cast out of this Island*; But a *rejection* of an *Authority*, is a *recession* from that *Authority*; therefore you are guilty of a *recession* from the formerly-acknowledg'd Authority. So far for Government. Now for Doctrines and Practices. You once beleeved and practised as the Roman Catholike Church, to wit, when you were in her: That you reformed you confess; and *C. 7. S. 14.* call your reformations, *recessions* from the *doctrines and practises of Rome*. *A recession* therefore was made by you, both from the *former Government*, as also the former *doctrines and practises*: But a *recession* is a *voluntary departure*, as plain sence evidences; therefore you made a *voluntary departure* from the formerly-acknowledg'd *government, doctrines and practises of Rome*. Now then, to tell us so long after; and after so large a narrative confession of your own to the contrary, that you *departed not*, *but were cast out*, as if nothing had been done by you till the tenth year of Queen *Elizabeth*, is such a piece of forgetfulness, as could onely be peculiar to Dr. *Hammond*.

But I perceive the Doctor thinks there is no *Schism*, till the Pope have actually excommunicated

nicated: as if there might not bee a criminal departure from the former Faith, its Rule, Sacraments, and the Churches Government, before the Church comes with her spiritual rod of Excommunication to whip the Offender. From all these, I have already manifested, that you had divided, and by so doing, made your selves uncapable of Communion with the former Faithful. Upon this, it was necessary to separate the Faithful from you in divine offices; and therefore both just and fitting to *excommunicate* you; as well to punish you (who were long before schismaticks) for your crime, as to warn the founder flock to abstain from your contagious communion. Neither can you blame us for excommunicating you, whom your own grounds, here delivered, clear in that point from any imputation of Rigour: Your selfe confessing *that you rejected Roman Catholikes* 8.5. *from your assemblies, and censur'd them upon their avowed contumacy against the orders of your Church.* Let us know then, why our Church might not doe the same, and with much more reason to you, who were once members of her, and whose *recession* from her *orders, and contumacious persisting* still, your selfe will witness; shew us, I say, why she had not as great Authority over those, who were once hers, as your claimes over those, who were never yours; or if you cannot, then grant, you were justly excommunicated by her once, and remain as justly excommunicated still, until you *disavow* that contumacy, which obstructs your Communion.

His second Reason why wee hindred the *external Communion* (as he calls that confusion

is *our imposing such conditions on our Communion, that they cannot subscribe without sinning or seeming to sin against conscience.* And what sin, or seeming to sin, is this, think you? *the beleefe of Doctrines, or Approbations of Practises, which they neither beleeve nor approve of.* The question is not, Mr. Doctor, whether *you beleeve or approve of them,* or no, but whether it were your own sinful pride of understanding which made you and your first reformers disbelieve all their teachers, and think themselves understood more of Gods mind, than all the world before them; and yet, when they had done, acknowledg'd themselves but fallible in their contrary beleefe; that is, uncertain whether they or their teachers were in the right; and is not this a wise ground for any schollar to disbelieve his Master, or any child to disobey his father and mother. If it were pride, which made you think otherwise, (as truly no man knowing the grounds you build your reformation upon, and how the greatest and most learned authority this world could shew, opposed you can in reason judge any other) then it is not innocency in you, nor a sufficient excuse for your not-Communion, that you doe not believe *these doctrines*; but it is your sin; and the root of all your misery and schism, that you correct not that vice, and so leave off that erroneous judgement, which misleades you from the truth; usurping the office of your spiritual guide the holy Catholick Church. Free the soul then first of that *vice*, and then you'l stand in no need to *offer violence to your minds*, nor be afraid to make an *unsound confession*; the feare of which you pretend for your excuse. C. 9. S. 7.

But

But of this I have said already more then was needful.

Yet Mr. *Hamond* is ready to *contest* and *maintain his negatives by grounds that all good Christians ought to be concluded by.* I hear again a sound of words in general hovering in the aire. But what are those grounds in particular, by which he will *contest his doctrines?* he tells us in his last *Paragrapaph* that they are *prooves from Scriptures, or the first Writers* (*those of the first* 300. *yeares*) *or the four General Councils.* But let us ask first by whose interpretation of Scripture *he will contest his Negatives?* hee will tell you, by his own, or some few others like himselfe, which (not professing themselves *Infallible*) he must tell you also hee is uncertain whether it be right or no: And is not this a wise ground to contest his Negatives by, against the positive doctrine of Gods Church? But let us ask whether he thinks our Saviours command *to hear the Church*, bee a ground by which all Christians ought to bee concluded. Perhaps, after much shaking his head between loathnes to reject our Saviours words, and unwillingnesse to grant any thing to the Church, he will answer, *yes; the Church of the first* 300. *yeares.* Then ask him again, who taught all good *Christians*, that they should hear the Church of the first 300. years onely, and then stop their ears against her perpetually for the future? hee is gravell'd. Again, ask him whether those first three century of yeares treat of all late sprung *Negatives?* Hee must tell you, *No, they do not treat all our new-controversies*; but he will praise them notwithstanding, to put you off your question; and tell you *they are the purest and*

most

most primitive times. Ask him next, why hee recurs to such obscure times, and stark dumb in our present controversies? and hee must answer, if he will speak out candidly, that *durum telum necessitas*, necessity drives him to adhere to them. All the following Ages, except that holy year in which was celebrated the Council of *Chalcedon*, inveighing most *impurely* against his new doctrine. Thus the Dr. chuses *obscurity* for the *Patron* of his cause, which can bee no Sun to reveal truth, though it may serve for a dark hole to hide falshood. Neither can hee from his grounds pretend otherwise to contest his *Negatives*, than by *meer negative arguments*, so as the inference must bee this; Our points of doctrine were not contradicted by the Writers of the first 300. yeares, therefore they are true: This is the utmost he can conclude thence; whereas, to make this illation valid, he must first prove, that all truths about Faith were debated in those dayes; next, that all which was debated then, is come downe certainly to our times. Neither of which he will bee able to manifest. Will not any judicious Reader think such *Rules* as these like to binde all good Christians to bee concluded by them? *Dr. Hammonds interpretations of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, that say nothing, or else very little to the by, concerning the question*; And lastly, negative arguments. To omit that the Writers of those his primitive times, speak as much and as efficaciously against the Doctors cause, as is imaginable their present circumstances should invite or give them occasion. To end then this Chapter with the Doctors words something alter'd, these *pitiful evasions*, and unwarrantable

warrantable shifts, *put together, and applied to this matter,* will manifestly charge *him with an apparent guilt of this second branch of the second sort of Schism.*

SECT. 5.

Our pretended Uncharitableness in judging and despising others, retorted upon the Objecters.

IN his tenth Chapter hee gives us a short Sermon concerning the third *species* of *Schism*, which is against *mutual charity*; divided by him into two Heads, of *judging and despising others*: both which hee very charitably disclaimes in behalfe of their Church, and would very courteously present us with them. But, to omit his pious formalities, and come to grounds. Doe you think it is *uncharitableness* to judge as our Saviour judg'd; that is, to believe what he said to be true? Our Sauiours judgment is, that if any one doe *not heare the Church, let him be to thee, as a heathen or a publican.* If therefore we see with our eyes, that you acknowledge no Church to be heard, and yet proceed not to such harsh termes as our Saviour himselfe hath laid down to us, I hope you will impute it to us as a great moderation, and not as *uncharitableness*. Now, that you did not hear the Church, when you broke from ours (and much lesse since) is most evident: For your first Reformers most manifestly *recede*

led from the former acknowledged *Govern-*
ment, Rule of Faith, Sacraments, Doctrines, and
practises of the Roman Catholike Church, of
which you were then a member, as hath been
shewn and acknowledg'd; and she teaching
them the contrary then, it could not bee said
they heard her, when they began their Reforma-
tions. Neither did they joyn themselves with
any other Church, whom they might bee said
to *hear*; nor was this doctrin taught by the very
Church of *England* it selfe in the former age;
since their Forefathers held and taught them a
contrary beleefe. Evident then it is, that those
few, who, in the time of King *Henry* the 8th,
adhered to his lust-born Reformation, neither
communicated with, nor heard *any Church at* Dr.
all; but began a new Church, a new Govern- *Ham:*
ment, a new Faith, and new practises, both *C.7.*
without and against the command of that *S.12.*
Church, which both they and their Forefathers,
ever since that Church first taught them Chri-
stianity, held to be the onely true Christian
Congregation. How can we then, seeing e-
vidently they *heard not any Church*, judge other-
wise then that our Saviours words are true,
that is, that they are in a sad condition; and
you much sadder, who have not returned
whence they *receded*, but followed their steps,
and have made the breach wider; unlesse per-
haps you think or hope the crime is lesse, be-
cause there is now a greater multiplicity of
offenders, which harden one another to obsti-
nacy by their number.

Next, is it *uncharitableneſſe* not to renounce
that Rule of *Faith*, in which clearly is founded
all the Certainty we have of *Christs* Law, and

all the hopes of our salvation; to wit, the inerrability of our Church, beleeved by our Ancestors, ever since *Christs* doctrine first dawn'd to the dark world? Yet this which witnesses your doctrine heretical, wee must absolutely renounce, ere wee can deem you other than Hereticks: Either wee must judge the highest Tribunal in the world, upon whose *living voice* wee build all Faith and true sence of the Scriptures, to have lyed; that is, wee must judge our highest Superiours, Pastours, Teachers, and Church to be erroneous in Faith and heretical, or else we must judge you our equals at most, and (till you out-law'd your selves) her subjects, to be truly criminal, and rightly condemned.

Thirdly, *Unus Deus, una Fides, unum Baptisma*, there is but *one Faith*, as there is but *one God*. That your Faith and ours cannot be one, is most evident. All our whole Church condemning yours as heretical; and yours, when the humour takes them, as much detesting ours as erroneous. Nay, the most dreadful sacrifice of our Saviours Body and Blood, our *Holy of Holies*, reviled and abhorred by your Church, as a *blasphemous fiction and pernicious imposture*. Both our Faiths therefore cannot be *one*, and consequently one of them is not but *errour* against *Faith*; which, if firmly adhered to, as it is, must be *Heresie*; either your Faith then, or ours, under penalty of maintaining a contradiction, must necessarily be held as *heresie*. Now comes this Doctor, and accuses us for the most uncharitable men in the world, because wee will not judge our own Faith *heretical*, and so free theirs. Remember

Art. 31. of the Church of England

our Saviours words (*Mr. Dr.*) *He that believes not, is judg'd already*; Joyn this to *Una Fides*, and our contradicting one another in most important points of Faith; and you must necessarily conclude, that neither of us, if hee bee certain he beleeves and has that *one Faith*, can make conscience of judging the other, since the other *is judged already*, in *receding* from, or not having the true Faith. Nay, if he *judge* him not to be *already judged*, he must judge himself to be in the same state of a *self-judg'd unbeleever*; or rather, on the contrary, hee must make conscience of not judging him, for such; but, by a collogning piece of courtesie, draw him into eternal perdition, and himselfe follow him, for his uncharitable connivence. Thus you see the Dr. never meddles with any point, but he blunders and destroys all the reason that ever concerns it.

Neither is it Charity, but partly fear of most open shame, partly ignorance of any grounds, or what belongs to a Church or a Government, which makes him not *judge* us to bee both *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*; since one of us must be such, and he has a good mind to give us these new Titles, whom hee very angrily here calls his *vaunting enemies*. But as the former body of our Church, out of which their few Reformers receded, standing and remaining still one and the same, together with that plain and common notion that a *tree* is not said *to be broken from a branch, but the branch from the tree*. leaves them so much light of apprehension, as not to dare to call us *schismaticks*; so the acknowledg'd antiquity of our doctrine, ever persisting the self-same, and the confessed inno- *C.* 10 *S.* 3.

vation of theirs frights them, though unwillingly from styling us *Innovators* and *Hereticks*.

Fourthly, our judging you, may indeed seem to bee *errour*, but *malice* and *uncharitablenesse* it cannot. For since the grounds of our Faith, which necessarily oblige us to *judge* thus of you, and all such, were held by us, as firmly before you were ever dream'd of, as at present; you cannot object that wee invented new grounds to conclude so hardly of you in our thoughts; nor that they were purposely and maliciously aymed at your then-unhatch'd Congregation. So as you may, if you please, pretend that all the grounds, on which wee hold our Faith, Gods word, and its true Interpretation, are erroneous, and therefore that our so judging of you, necessarily springing from those Grounds, is an *errour*; yet malice or uncharitablenesse you cannot call it, since wee cannot hinder the consequence from following, without denying the grounds which infer it; that is, without denying the certainty and truth of all our Faith. And me thinkes the zeal of our Missionaries to reduce others from the ill state wee conceive them in, with daily hazarding, and often laying down actually their lives for that end, both in this Countrey and many others, should transfer the charge of *Uncharitablenesse* to your colder party; for sure it can bee no lesse to *judge* them *uncharitable*, who so readily and willingly lay down their dearest lives, to redeem the soules of their very enemies and persecutors from a beleeved danger. Yet this is the Doctors *Goliah's sword* (as he calls it) *wherewith* he threatned

ned to *give a fatall wound*; Though in truth I can discern no more edge in it than in a *Beetle*.

S. Cyprians testimony of *Neminem damnantes, neminem a communione nostrâ arcentes, Condemning no man, nor driving any from his Communion*, was spoken of himselfe, of his own temper towards the rest of Gods Church, acknowledged by himselfe to be such, and that in the point of *Rebaptization of Infants*; which, though held stiffely by himselfe; yet his charity so moderated his zeal, that hee expresst his indifferency in those alledged words; Neither had he reason to *deny Communion* to other *Catholikes* for a private opinion onely, till the Church had interpos'd her Authority. But where did the Doctor read either in *S. Cyprian*, or any other Father, that they admitted to their *Communion* those who had been condemned as *Schismaticks* and *Hereticks*, by all the *Churches in communion with the See of Rome*; as were the Protestants? Unlesse hee can shew this, hee abuses most absurdly that holy and learned Father, by seeming to make him allow a promiscous admission of all Sects, let them be what they please: which favours more of Doctor *Hammonds* spirit, who would have all come to his Church thas call themselves Christians, than of Blessed *S. Cyprians*, who knew better what belonged to Church-order and discipline.

But I thought there was one of the Drs mysteries in it, when I saw the words of the Father alledged to an end so inconsonant to his Doctrine, without quoration of any *place, Book, Chapter*, or *Epistle*. But Mr. *Hammond* will

C. 10. S. 3. have the thing between us to bee onely *differences in opinion*; and indeed if that suppositi-on, that the onely ground of all our Faith, in which consists our main difference, were but an *Opinion* (as on his part it is not) I see no reason why either hee or I should trouble our selves to write Books in defence of an *Opinionative Faith*; it were better in that case to eat, drink, shake hands, and be merry; nor trouble our selves with thinking whether there bee a Heav'n or no, which wee can never come (the ground of Faith being but an *Opinion*) to any certain knowledge of.

In the last place of his first Part of this *Schism*, hee tells us, *we beg the question in calling them* Schismaticks, because *they deny it, and offer to prove the contrary.* Certainly Mr. *Hammond* has been so long in the Pulpit, that hee has forgot the fashion of the Universities, where there is no disputation, but the one affirmes, and the other denies; and the *Defendant* holds his Conclusion for true, till the *Opponent* proves the contrary; without being judged to incur the fault of begging the question. Besides, to what dark holes you run for clear proofes, we have already shewn; and, till you can shew us a greater Authority to acquit you, than is the Churches Tribunal, which condemned you, your denying it will but double the fault, not clear it; especially since the *material fact* of *Schism*, that is, dividing from the persons with whom you formerly communicated, cannot bee deny'd, however you may pretend the intention or cause of it to be doubtful or obscure.

Ere I leave this first part, of *judging* others;

I

I desire the Reader to fancy in his own minde as perfect a *Schismatick* as can bee imagin'd, and therfore deservedly *cast out* by the Church; which done, let him read this Doctors tenth Chapter, and hee shall easily perceive that hee has not brought one word for himselfe, which the other justly condemned *schismatick* may not with as good reason make use of. So easily it is discoverable by the manner of weapon the Dr. wears, whose side he is on, and whose banner he fights under.

His second charge of *Schism against mutual Charity*, is, that we *despise* and *set at nought the Brother*. Good Brother Doctor tell mee how we despise you? We pity you indeed, seeing the calamities you are fallen into by your former fault; as also to see you persist still obstinately blind in the midst of your punishment: But despise you wee doe not. Yet you conclude *the cause by the effect*, that is, our *casting you out of the Church*; and therefore say *the guilt lies on our side*. *EUGE QUANTI EST SAPERE!* Let us put the demonstration *a posteriori* in form, and you shall see the invincibleness of it.

They, who cast others out of the Church, despise them, and are guilty of schism against Charity.

But the Roman Church cast us out of the Church.

Therefore they despise us, and are guilty of schism against Charity.

By which account no Church can condemn any one of *schism*, but shee must bee a *schismatick* her selfe; whereas wee did not cast them out, but upon their *avowed contumacy against the*

C.9. S.5. *the orders of our Church*, which the Doctor himselfe holds as a reason sufficient for the Protestant to excommunicate *Catholikes*. Where you see the first Proposition can onely be sustained by making this shameless assertion good, that no man can cast another out of the Church, but he must despise him, and consequently bee guilty of *unchartiableness and schism*. But the Doctor argues, as if a Rebel should confess at large, that indeed he rejected the Authority of the Supreme Magistrate, and *receded* from the former Lawes and Customes of the Common-wealth; yet notwithstanding they must not punish him and his company; or if they doe, they are guilty of faction, sedition, dissention, and despising their fellowes. What King now could bee so hard-hearted as to punish a Rebel defending himself with such a wise, solid, and rational plea? The Doctor confess'd that they rejected the Authority of the Pope, formerly acknowledg'd to bee *Supreme*; that they *receded from the doctrines and practises of Rome*, of which Church they were a little before members and subjects; and, when he has done, tells this Church it must not punish them, nor excommunicate them; or, if she doe, she is guilty of *schism*, *uncharitableness*, *of despising and setting at nought the Brother*. But pray Mr. Doctor, what *schism* is it (after you had run away from the Church, ever since *King Henry* fell in love) to tell you in the tenth year of Queen *Elizabeth*, when she saw you would not mend, but grew daily worse and worse, that she could no longer forbear to punish your pertinacious disobedience?

After

After this the Doctor crouds together a great company of advantages of our Religion, with which wee pre-poſſeſſe our ſubjects; though the Doctor miſtakes in ſome; and which hee ſayes are ſo many reaſons, why they doe not *ſet us at nought*, and *deſpiſe us*.

First, *the advantage of our education*. True, indeed we are taught to obey our *Superiors*, and hear our *Paſtors*.

Secondly, *the preſcribed credulity to all that the Church ſhall propoſe*. Good Mr. Dr, whom ſhould the Faithful beleeve in telling them the ſence of Gods word, if not the Church? ſuch pitiful gueſſing Southſayers as you? Are not our Saviours words *Hear the Church*; and *I am with you ever till the end of the world*, plaine enough, and ſufficient to ſecure their credulity to ſuch a Heav'n-aſſiſted-Miſtreſs? And indeed how can you think thoſe, who cannot employ ſufficient time to ſtudy out their Faith, ſhould be otherwiſe inſtructed than by Credulity? Look whether your *Proſelytes* doe not rely even upon your private Authority? ſo natural and neceſſary is it there ſhould bee an Authority to governe weak people.

Thirdly, *the doctrine of infallibility*. That is, wee tell them Faith is *certain*, and hath certain grounds: a grievous accuſation!

Fourthly, the ſhutting up the *Scriptures* in an unknown Languge. That is, taking order that the *unlearned nor unſtable pervert them not to their own damnation*.

Fifthly, *the impoſſibility that the multitude ſhould ſearch or examine Tradition with their own eyes*.

eyes. That is, the Doctor is utterly ignorant what Tradition is. Is it such an impossible matter for the meanest person that hath age enough, to know what doctrine was held by Christians ten yeares agoe? or for them that liv'd ten yeares agoe, to know what was held 20. years since, and so forth. Especially, Faith not being a meer speculation, but shewing it selfe in practise, which proclames that heavenly law of Grace so openly, that all must see it except such as neither have no eyes, or wilfully shut them. This (Sir) is the main mystery of *Tradition*, which you imagin'd wee kept reserved like the Ark of the Testament and *Mose's Tables*, from the sight of the people.

Sixthly, *The prosperous estate of the Roman Church, and the persecutions and calamities of yours.* I see wee are in some sence beholding to our good fortune, or your misfortune, *for your charitableness.* But you complain for nothing; what persecution suffer you in *England* in comparison of the Catholikes? What *Laws* make it Treason to become a Protestant, as they do to bee reconciled to the Catholike Religion? What *Oaths* are impos'd on Protestants to renounce their Faith under pain of high Treason and forfeiture of their Estates, as in those of *Supremacy* and *Abjuration* against Catholikes? Read over the large Volume of *Penal Statutes* made in the dayes of your Dominion, and you shall find, that Catholikes can neither be married, nor baptiz'd, nor taught at home, nor sent abroad, nor maintain'd by their parents while they live, nor buried, when they dye, without incurring the danger of a *Premunire*, or some other severe penalty. In all these I am confident your kind of Protestancy never

en-

endured the least punishment; but a light cross is enough to overload a weak patience, and every small discountenancing makes those that have enjoy'd a long ease, cry out, *persecution*. I see your parchment Church shrinks and crackles at the sight of the fire, while the Catholike remaines firm and unconsum'd, nay growes clearer in the midst of it. And yet I doe not intend to deny, many of you have been very great losers by these late Revolutions, but onely to say your sufferings are to bee refer'd to a civil, not religious account, or at least that nothing, even in your own judgment, essential to Religion, is persecuted, or so much as deny'd in *England*; for *Bishops*, and *Service-book*, and *Kings Supremacy* you must not call essential, without contradicting your own both profession and practise, since you can so kindly embrace your Sister-Churches, and communicate with them, who deny those points as zealously as the fiercest *Anabaptist*.

Lastly, *our literal sound of Hoc est Corpus meum*, which the Doctor calls *our principal espoused doctrine of Transubstantiation*. Indeed wee had rather wed our beleefe to that sence of Gods word, which Fathers, Councils, and the perpetual doctrine and practise of Gods Church hath recommended to us, as the Virgin-daughter of him who is the *Truth*; than to a loose *Polygamy* of 40. several interpretations; *Minerva's* born of your own heads, whose mutually-contradicting variety shews them to come by the paternal line, from him who is the Father of all falshood.

For these *prejudices instill'd into the hearts of Catholikes*, the Doctor and his Church spare us very

very charitably, *and are far from casting us out of the Church.* For Gods sake, Mr. Dr whither would you have cast us? Would you throw the house out of the windowes? I mean the Church, Gods house, out of the window of *Schism*, which you broke in the side of it.

Again, let us but see how artificial, nay incomparable *nonsence* this Dr. speakes. I conceive nothing can bee cast out of a thing that was never in it; shew us then that there was once a constituted Church of Protestants, govern'd by the King as Supreme Head, and holding their doctrines and practises, in which the Roman Catholike once was, but receded from that Doctrine and Government, and invented this new Religion which hee holds at present. Unlesse the Catholikes were once thus in you, how could you cast them out? What a weaknes is this to think that *Robin Hood, Little John*, and a few Outlawes, doe *King Richard* and all *England* a great deal of favour in not casting them out of their Rebel-common-wealth, as no true members of it, and denying them the protection of their seditious counter-lawes; under which Lawes, and in which Common-wealth, neither the King nor his good subjects were ever reputed.

One word more ere I leave this point, to let the rational Reader see, whether the Protestants or we bee more chargeable of judging and despising others. Suppose, Mr. Doctor, wee, who are sons of the Catholike Church, had both judged and despised you upon our own private heads, it had been but to *judge and despise our equals.* But your Reformation

had been impoſſible, unleſſe you had firſt both judged, deſpiſed, and preferd your ſelves above your *Supreme Governours*, the Church and all your Forefathers. The chief Government, impower'd actually over you in *Eccleſiaſtical Affaires*, you *rejected and caſt out of this Iſland*. C. 7. S. 5. Next, many of your wiſe Brethren ſince, preaching, teaching, and writing whole Bookes, to ſhew that that Governour is *Antcichriſt*, the Beaſt in the *Apocalypſe*, and what not? Could theſe things bee done without *judging* and *deſpiſing*? You made *Reformations* and *receſſions* from the former Churches doctrine, cry'd out ſhe had erred, was a *Strumpet*, the *Whore of Babylon*, *impious*, *ſacrilegious*, *idolatrous*. Was not this the moſt raſh judging, the moſt venemous railing at and reviling of Gods ſacred Spouſe, formerly your Miſtreſſe and Mother, that ever was foam'd out of the mouth of madneſs it ſelfe? Again, the whole world, whom you eſteemed, before, good Chriſtians, and all your Anceſtors in England, condemned, by their contrary beleefe, your new Reformed Doctrine: And, doe you think your innovators could have broach't their oppoſite doctrines without both *judging* and *deſpiſing* all this vaſt Authority? Your Charity then, Mr. Doctor, in this point, can bee onely imagin'd to conſiſt in this, that you have not *judged* and *deſpiſed* your ſelves; for all elſe, that you thought formerly to deſerve any Authority, you both judged, deſpiſed, rejected, revil'd, and condemned. In a word, our judging you, is our ſubſcribing in our own thoughts to that Verdict, which the Church has paſt againſt you, whoſe tribunal was held by

by all the whole Christian world (and your selves also, till you became guilty) to be the most high and sacred that ever gave sentence since the world's Creation.

As for despising your persons, we deny it as a meer calumny; and professe our selves bound to honour every one according to his quality and degree; the reasons indeed, which you produce to clear your selfe from *Schism*, we despise, as worse than ridiculous; A Paradox in a matter indifferent, if maintain'd ingeniously, deserves its commendations: but the most manifest absurdities that can bee imagin'd, and in which are interessed mens salvations, such as is the renouncing an Authority granted to bee the most ancient, most sublime, most sacred, in the world, upon fallible, incertain, and unevident grounds; and onely sustain'd by plain contradictions, false and self-feign'd suppositions, *ID ESTS* of our own adding, the best proof not arriving so high as a probability; These, I say, Mr. Doctor, have nothing to secure them from our *despising*, unlesse perhaps, it bee their falling *below our contempt*. Of the mixt temper of these is the constitution of your Book; which shews that you have been used to row at your own dull pleasure in the shallow and softly-murmuring current of a Sermon; but never launch't with a well-rigg'd Ship of *Reason* into the Boysterous Maine of deeper controversies.

Thus the Doctor concludes his Treatise of *Schism*, closing up his tenth Chapter with these words; *I foresee not any objection which may give mee temptation or excuse further to enlarge on this matter.* No truly, I could never yet

yet discern you guilty of that fault, that objections gave you any great temptation to answer them; since I have not seen you put one Objection or Argument of ours worth a straw, from the beginning of the Book to the end; On the contrary, when you light on a wrong supposition of your own, as that the Pope is onely a private *Patriarch*; that the *Papal* Authority in this *Island* came to the *Pope* from the Title of its Conversion, or from *Concession* of our Kings; then I observe a very *strong temptation in you to enlarge a whole Chapter* upon that, which no body objects, except your own fancy.

Hee adds, that he *professes not to know any other branch of Schism, or colour of fastning that guilt upon our Church, made use of by any, which hee hath not prevented.* Yes, Mr. Doctor, I told you before, how you have omitted the two *chief branches of Schism*, and most of all made use of by us against you; to wit, *Schism* from the whole body of the Church, and from its highest *Tribunal*, The General Councils; which wee as freshly, and more chiefly, charge upon you, than any of the rest.

The Last SECT.

Our Objection that the pretended Church of England *is now invisible, maintained and asserted to be just.*

Schism being thus establish't, as legitimate and laudable, the Patron of it resolvs to prosecute his Project home, and therefore strives in this last Chapter to wipe off any prejudice arising from their present distractions and persecutions, the proper effects of their Schism. The occasion seemes taken from some of our side, calling them *The late Church of England*; as if now a *FUIT* were put to their former *being* by their present misfortune. Our advantage offer'd from thence hee formes (and that rightly) into this objection; that *it is absolutely necessary to communicate with some one visible Church*; that *now the Church of England is not such, and consequently the Church of Rome, so illustriously visible, must be taken up in stead of it.*

C. II *S.* I.

Thus far, abstracting from the partiality in his manner of expression, wee both agree. In answer to which, the Doctor alledges first *That a member of the English Church was not under this guilt of not communicating with some one visible Church twenty yeares agoe; and consequently unlesse he have contracted this guilt since*

C. II. *S.* 2.

b

by commission or omission of something, hee can no more bee charged with the Crime now, than formerly. All this while the Doctor is in a mistake, and runs on very currantly, but quite out of his way. For we doe not object this present condition to them, as a *crime* or *guilt* (rather that which was twenty yeares and more ago, was their crime, and this their punishment) but as a *different state* from the former, or indeed more truly, *the want of a State.* For twenty yeares agoe, though they wanted the substance, yet they had at least a shadow or Ghost of a Church, which *might delude* the eyes of the simple; but now even *that* has disappear'd and vanish't into Aire. Our advantage, not taken, but offer'd, from thence is this, that as before they had a shew of a Church; so their adherents, whose weaker eyes could not distinguish *substance* from *shadow*, might have then some shadow of motive or excuse, for remaining in it, and not returning to us; but now this fayery apparition being gone, not even so much as the least resemblance of a motive is left to lead them through the wayless path of their dark doctrine; or hinder them from returning to the common beaten road of their Ancestors.

The objection of this then is not vain, as the Dr. imagins, since a new and stronger motive offer'd, deserves in reason a new, distinct, and fresh proposal. I grant therefore, Mr. Dr. that it is not your choice, crime, or offence, to bee in this misery, though it bee your fault that you were brought into it; it being a connatural punishment, orderly subsequent to the vice of *Schism*, as shall afterwards be shewn.

And the present invisibility of your Church is never the lesse true and real, though we admit it be your misfortune, not your crime; since a ship may as well bee cast away in an unavoydable storme, as by the negligence of the Pilot.

Neither doe I take it *to be the saddest part of your infelicity* (as you call it) but rather the greatest happines that Gods sweetly-chastising mercy could have sent you, that, by weighing your present dissolution, and the causes of it, you may retrive your wandrings, and recollect all your scatter'd and distracted members into the ever-firmly United Body of the holy *Catholike Church.*

C. 11 S. 3. Thirdly (for the Doctor was so eagerly zealous to clear his twenty-yeares-ago Protestant, that hee put *first* and *thirdly*, but quite forgot *secondly*) he runs on in his errour, that wee impute this state of their Church to the *Protestant* as a *guilt*, from which he goes about to clear him. *For if he hath contracted this guilt*, (saies the Dr.) *it must be by some irregularity of actions contrary to the standing Rule & Canons of this Church*; whereas I conceive it very regularly consequent to your new Canons, that you should fall into this very condition you now groan under; For your Rule and Canons granting the Authority of the Secular Power to be the *BASIS* of your Reformation, Head of the Church-Government, *Supreme* in Ecclesiastical matters, and your onely defence and excuse, when wee ask you upon what Authority you left us, it is natural and imbred in the very primogenial Constitution of your Church, that it should be dissolvable at the pleasure of the same

same power which set it up. It is not therefore the standing to the Rule and Canons of your Church, which secures you in a firm and immutable perpetuity, but those very grounds are they which engage you in a fleeting and perpetual mutability.

You applaud with your *Encomiums* the *Protestant, that hath actually lost his possessions, liberty, &c. rather than depart from his rule*; which truly I conceive a very irrational action in him, and deserving more pity than commendations. For the 39. *Articles*, being the most distinct *Rule* Protestants have, one of which defines that *General Councils both can Erre and have erred*; whence follows *a fortiori*, that their own *Meeting* where these Articles (their Rule) were made, being at most but a *Provincial Assembly*, is much more lyable to *errour*, I see no reason why hee should lose the certain possession of present goods for maintaining an uncertain *opinion*: especially since hee holds salvation can bee had in other *Sects*, as appeares by Dr. *Hammonds* admitting all whom hee calls Christians to his Communion. And if the Doctor reply, it was their conscienciousness to hold what they supposed true: I answer, their conscience is imprudently govern'd, whilst it instigates them to professe with their own so great disadvantage and loss, what they had no obligation to hold; for none can be oblig'd to the beleef of a point which himself & those who propose it are uncertain whether it be true or no. Though (if I be not misinform'd) the greater part of your suffering-fellow-Protestants have had more wit, and most commonly were put out upon other pretences than their Religion.

Art. 21

C. 9. *S.* 3.

Thus far the Doctor hath proceeded clearing himselfe from the *want of a visible Church*, imagining we object it, a *guilt* or *crime*, whereas we only propose it, and more urgingly presse it to the consideration of the missed Protestants, as a *decay*, *corruption*, *annihilation* of the former visible shadow of a Church, and the occasion of a new fault in them; that, having lost their own, they return not to ours, out of which they confesse they came, and
C. 11. S. 5. of which they professed theirs to be a member.

In the next place hee tells us, *that as yet, Blessed bee God, the Church of England is not invisible, it is preserved in Bishops and Presbyters rightly ordained, and multitudes rightly baptized, none of which have fallen off from their profession.* Where the last words are most certainly true, if he means that none of those *who yet stand have as yet fallen off*, which I conceive is his meaning; for all those who have not stood, have fal'n off, which are enow to shew of what metral their Church was made; and whether more have fal'n or stood, let the Doctor judge. But as for the rest of his selfe-congratulation, it is a miserable piece of self flattery, and which his own grounds quite discountenance. For if a Church be a Congregation of the Faithful, and Faith (as *S. Paul* argues) comes by *hearing*, hearing from *preaching*, preaching from *mission*, or being sent; which mission is an Act of *Jurisdiction*; it follows, that if their *Bishops* and *Presbyters* have now no *Jurisdiction*, then the Protestants have neither *lawful mission*, *preaching*, *hearing*, *faith*, nor consequently, *Church*. Now, that they can claim no *Jurisdiction*,

diction, followes out of their own grounds; for when we urge them upon what Authority they cast off the former Ecclesiastical Superior, governing Gods Church in chief, they run for their defence, to the secular Power, to which they attribute *supreme Jurisdiction in matters Ecclesiastical within this Island*; It is acknowledg'd (saith the Dr. *C. 7. S. 2.*) *that the Papal Power in Ecclesiastical Affaires, was both by Acts of Convocation of the Clergy, and of Parliament, cast out of this Kingdome.* Thus you see he recurs to a power meerly secular, in the Parliament, for renouncing and abolishing a spiritual power and Jurisdiction, held before, greater than ever the Protestant *Prelacy* was imagin'd. Meerly secular, I say; for the Doctor confesses here, that *it is easie to believe that nothing but the apprehension of dangers which hung over them, could probably have inclined the Clergy to that their first Act*; And how great influence this apprehension of danger might have over the secular part of the Parliament, is easie to be determined, since they saw the gravest Patriot in the Kingdome in danger of death, for holding against the Kings new pretended Title; and many others, for the same respect, most cruelly persecuted. A Parliament therefore meerly of *Seculars*, and those such as can in no wise be presum'd free, was held by you of sufficient Authority to renounce a Jurisdiction, deemed formerly much higher, and known to bee almost ten times longer setled in possession than your *Prelacy*; I see not therefore why a *secular power* should not bee, in your grounds, sufficient to abolish a jurisdiction, which onely leaned and relied on a *secular support*.

C. 7. S. 5.

But what was done in *King Henry*'s dayes, being disannul'd again by both the spiritual and secular power in Queen *Maries* Reign, must necessarily be held of you invalid, if you will goe consequently to your own grounds. Let us then examine the resurrection of your Church, by a Parliament held in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*; In which Parliament (to omit the small title the Queen had to the Crown, being born of a second bedfellow, whilst King *Henry*'s former Wife was yet alive, and declared illegitimate both by the whole Parliament and her own Fathers Act) were wanting the *spiritual Lords*, the *Bishops*; who were, for their Religion, kept, at that time, in prison; For which reason, when a *Quere* was raised about the beginning of the late long Parliament, whether Acts made without *Bishops*, were valid, it is said to have been resolved affirmatively, upon this ground, *because otherwise the Protestant Religion, voted by a Parliament, in which was no Bishops, would be invalid also.*

I see not then what great advantages could be in that *Parliament*, to Vote out the greater Authority of the Pope, or give your new-made Bishops (ordained God knowes how) *Jurisdiction*; but the same may be pretended by a succeeding Parliament, to deprive them, and set up a new Form of their own. Certain it is, that you acknowledge the *Secular Power* for the Source and first Fountain of your *Jurisdiction*; Since then, the present *Secular Power* has put a stop to your farther Ordination, and disannul'd your former *Jurisdiction*, your own grounds conclude you *de facto* no

urch;

Church; for if you have no *Jurisdiction*, you can have no influence of power over the *Laity*; and so no spiritual Common-wealth made up of *Bishop*, as *Head* and *Pastour*, and of the *Laity*, as *body* and *flock*. And, as for the present, this general *suspension* (should we say no more) of your Ecclesiastical power, makes you *de facto* no Church; so, in time the very *inward right* it selfe, which you pretend, may be justly *extinguish't*. For, since your Jurisdiction confessedly depends on the secular Authority, it followes, if *this* be suspended or abolish't, *that* must needs share in the same fate: Now, all the world agrees, that not onely the *possession* of a secular power may be interrupted by force, but the Right it selfe in time be absolutely lost; and the new Government, however at first introduc't, be at length purged of its original blemishes, into a clear and unquestionable Title. In which case certainly your Church would be no more visible in *England*, than it is now at *Geneva*. Which sufficiently differences your condition from that of the Primitive Christians, or the present English Catholikes, they claiming a Jurisdiction underived from the secular power.

In vain therefore would it be to tell us their *Character* remains, and therfore they are stil *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, since the *character* can only entitle them to a name, the *thing* being gone, to wit, their *power of Jurisdiction*, and consequently their *Mission*; For if they have no Authority to teach and preach more than the Layity, they are level'd into an equal pitch with them; so as now they cannot bee said to bee a *body*, but a *company* of mutually distracted

parts;

parts; not an orderly *Church* or *Congregation*, but a rude and indigested *Chaos* of Confusion.

It is not then, Mr. Doctor, *your serving God in private Families* which wee object to you for being an invisible Church (which you run upon in your 5. *Sect.*) but that which your self confesse here, that *Now all Order, Form, Bishops, and Liturgy is thrown out of your Church together.* It is your want of Pastoral and Episcopal Authority, which makes us conclude you *no Church.* Yet so good is your Logick, that in the next paragraph, you think, though Bishops be abolish't, *yet in case this come not through your fault, it cannot be charged against you:* so as though all *Prelacy* and *Superiority* be taken away, that is, though there be none that have power to preach and teach, and all be reduc'd into an equally-level'd *Anarchy*, yet as long as it happens not through your fault, you are still a Church; As if Doctor *Hammond* should say, though his body were cut into millions of incoherent Atomes, yet, as long as this happens not through his fault, it is still a *well-ordered Body, ID EST*, it is still *Hammond.*

C. 11 S. 7.

The parts of Gods Church are compacted into a Whole by Order, and as much depend upon *Spiritual Superiours*, having power to teach and preach *Christs* Law, as the Common-wealth doth on Secular Magistrates to preserve their temporal Lawes, and govern according to them; without this order the *Whole* is dissolved, the *Body* is lost, the *Church* is gone. Doubtless, Mr. Doctor, it is not the fault or *choice* of the present Protestants, that they are thus baffled and persecured (which yet you have spent this whole Chapter, except onely the first

first Paragraph, to prove.) It needs no such great and large disproose, to manifest that that which is so much against mens wills, should bee their Choice and Crime. Yet wee may justly impute your Churches ruine to the sandinesse of her foundation; which being the Authority of the secular Governors, must render her liable to change, as often as the unconstant wind of temporal circumstances shall alter the former Government, or as oft as the former Government yet remaining shall see it necessary for the present peace or conveniences of the Common-wealth, to introduce or admit the more prevailing sway of a new *Religion*.

But I foresee that the Doctor, to avoid this objection, will cling in with us, and call the *Antichristian* and *Idolatrous Romanists* their dear Brethren, and tell them they acknowledge their *Jurisdiction* and *Mission* to come from them, desiring them not to reject them now in their greatest necessity, but let them seem to have an Authority deriv'd from the Apostles by their meanes; proffering that they, in courteous recompence, will acknowledge *Rome* to bee *a true Church*. This indeed is ordinary with them; but yet as frivolous still as the former. For the Authority which our Church could give you, was onely to teach and preach Catholike Doctrine, and ordain others to doe the same; to govern the Catholike flock, and to preserve them in the anciently received Unity of Faith. The Authority to doe these could come indeed from us, and so if any who pretend to have received *Jurisdiction* from us, continue to execute and govern themselves by that

that Commission, so far they are warranted by the former Authorization; but if they went beyond their Commission, nay more, acted quite contrary to their Commission, I wonder what *Jurisdiction* or *Mission* they can pretend as derived from us. Our question then is of such a power as your Bishops pretend to, and exercised; that is, of bearing the Enfign of a Squadron of the Churches Enemies, Preaching an opposite Doctrine to the Church, which you pretend to have impower'd you, and ordaining others to doe the same.

Evident it is that the Roman Catholike Church, which is the only spiritual power you can think to have any *Jurisdiction* or *Mission* from, never gave you this Authority, wherefore it must come to you from the *meer secular Power*; on this Power therfore is built all the Authority you have to act as Protestants, or in order to the Protestant Church; and consequently the whole building of your Church was erected onely and solely upon this uncertain and sandy foundation. This made Mr. *Hooker* (one of the best, and perhaps the most prudent Writer of all that profession) affirm of their Church, *that it was not likely to continue more than fourscore years*; nor could he judge otherwise, seeing it bear evidently the Principles of corruption and mutability in its very constitution; to wit, the *materia prima* of a secular *Basis*; which continually exposed it to a mortality, as the formes of Government should have their ever-limited period; and discovering the professors and Governours of it to bee none of those to whom our Saviour promised his perpetual assistance *to the end of the world.*

Lib. 5. *num.* 79

world. How much happier then would you be, if leaving this fleeting and unbodied shadow, you would return and unite your selves to the Catholike Church, Which, enjoying this promise from our Saviour of an indefectible perpetuity, not onely experiences the certain faithfulness of that promise in a large continuance of 1600. yeares, but also sees with *Evidence*, perhaps more than scientifical, that the walls of this *Hierusalem* are built upon such strong foundations, that the Church, and the Authority and Jurisdiction of her Governours can never fail or decay; since they rely not on the slippery and weak prop of the temporal power for their Authority, but on those who received it from the eternal never-altering Fountain of all power, with Commission to delegate and transmit it with an uninterrupted succession to the future Governours of the Church, *till wee all meet in the Unity of Glory.*

Nor is the means of transmitting this Heaven-founded Jurisdiction to Posterity, less certain than is *the law of grace*, written in the hearts of the faithful, in indelible characters, that inviolable Rule of Faith, a Rock too adamantine to be undermin'd by human policy. Let then her enemies, though even Princes, rage as much as they please, nay even bandy and conspire together to subdue this free-born Kings Daughter to their prophane yoke; her Jurisdiction, as it ever hath, so will it ever remaine secure and inviolate, being independent of them, and (by reason of the state of *Eternity*, her end and aym) of a superiour order to their Authority; which was instituted only for the rightly dispencing the transitory goods of this world.

Your

Your parallel of the Jews suffering under the Zelot's fury, or the old Roman yoke, which you make account is so evident, that *the Reader will supercede all necessity of making it up*, I conceive to aym very little or nothing at your purpose: For (though they intruded unfit men into the Priestly dignity, yet they did not actually, neither could they possibly take away the Jurisdiction of the High Priest, because this Jurisdiction was not given them by those secular powers, but by God himself; the contrary of all which happens in your case, as has been shewn; For the Jurisdiction of your Bishops may be taken away by the same Parliamentary power that set it up. That it was not their guilt, nor yours neither, wee willingly grant; and I wonder you could imagine us so unwise, as to object that to be your voluntary *Crime*, which you cannot but know we hold to bee your involuntary punishment.

Your wishes and prayers for peace and communion among all who are called *Christians*, are no less ours; and this, not in words only, but in efficacious endeavours; and, in several Nations, with daily labours, and extreamest hazards, to reduce the straying flock to their safely-guarded fold. Nay, this Communion is so vehemently desired and thirsted after by us, that we are ready to buy it at any rate, except the forfeiture of the Certainty of Faith and its Rule; the forfeiture of which, is the loss of our own *Communion* also. If Mr. *Hammond* can perswade himself and his friends to return to this Rule of Faith, the *Churches Infallibility*, which onely can unite us in the same stedfast belief of Christs Doctrine; and to acknowledg the

the Supremacy of the Bishop of *Rome*; in the acknowledgment of which, consists the constant unity of Church-government; then not onely we, but all the Angels and Saints in heaven, who rejoyce at the conversion of sinners, shall joyn in exalting Jubilees for the Blessed and long wish't for return of our wandring and self-disinherited Brethren. The former of these (if Mr. *Hammond* will not believe it) I have told him where he may see it as visibly as is possible any thing should be made to the eye of Reason. The latter, to wit, the Popes Supremacy, is defin'd in the *Florentine Council*, subscribed to both by the Greek and Latine Churches; where, what the fourth General Council, held at *Chalcedon*, wrote to *Pope Leo*, that ὡς κεφαλὴ μελῶν ὑγιμονεύει, *that he was over the members* of the Church, *as their Head*, is more plainly expresst in these words, *We define that the holy Apostolical See, and the Bishop of Rome have the primacy over all the world, and that the Bishop of Rome is Successour to S.* Peter, *the Prince of the Apostles, and truly Christs Vicar, and Head of the whole Church; and the Father and Teacher of all Christians, and that there was given him in S.* Peter *from Christ a full power to feed, direct and govern the Catholike Church*: To these two points, if the Protestant will subscribe, that is, secure inviolate that which touches the root, and most vital and intrinsecal part of the Chruch, to wit, the Rule of Faith; she will not stick to open her outward rind, that is, offer some violence to her uniformity, in indifferent and more extrinsecal practises, to re-ingraft their dry and sapless branch, which now lies withering, into her ever-flourishing body.

Rushworth's Dial. & the Apol. for Traditi-on.

body. To which, if these poor endeavours of mine, may in the least contribute, I shall for the future not reprehend, but congratulate Dr. *Hammond* for his fortunate Errours, and honour his ill grounded reasons, as of richest value; which, by stirring up others to detest them, and shew what weak pleas are producible for *Schism*, became the happy occasion of his own, and others salvation; and of Embosoming the Daughter-Church of *England* in a Charitable Communion with her dearest Mother; by whose painful throwes she was first *born* to *Christ*, her *Spouse*; at whose *breasts* shee suck'd the first milk of his *Doctrine*, and from whose arms and ever-cherishing embraces, first by the malignity of an ill-govern'd passion, next by humane policy, shee has been so long separated.

FINIS.

DOWN-DERRY:

OR

Biſhop BRAMHAL's *Juſt Vindication* of the Church of *England* refuted.

MY choice at firſt directed me, rather to anſwer Mr. *Hammond*, than my Lord of *Derry*; having obſerv'd his Book not only to bear a greater vogue in the world, but to be inwardly furniſhed with Arguments more ſuitable to the profeſſion of a Divine; But after I had advanc'd paſt the mid-way of my journey, I met ſome Proteſtant friends, who, though formerly they had ſtill cry'd up the Doctor, yet ſoon as I told them, in confidence, that an Anſwer to his *Schiſm* would inſtantly bee ready for the the Preſs, they immediately began to extol the Biſhop, and demand either a preſent Reply to him, or elſe they ſhould not ſpare to conclude the Victory their own. When I had expreſt how weak and unreaſonable their diſcourſe

was, which, if admitted, would always judg him to have the right cauſe, that ſpeaks the laſt word. I parted with a promiſe; if, in ſtead of that ſport, which he far more than the other, tempts a wit-at leaſure to make with him, they would accept of a ſhort Refutation of the ſubſtantial paſſages, I ſhould not fail to endeavour their ſatisfaction: which thus I perform.

Reading, with ſome diligence, the Biſhops Book, I find, that as there is much commendable in it for induſtry, ſo is it expos'd to an unavoidable Check of being Patron to an ill Cauſe; whence it may bee a pattern of wit and labour, but little aſſiſtance to the truth, further than by ſhewing how weak Errour is. But, not to ſpend time and paper in vain, let us ſtate the controverſie clearly, that it may be ſeen how ſtrongly and pertinently his Diſcourſe proceeds; Not that I intend minutely to examine his whole Work, whereof the far greater part is little or nothing to our controverſie, as will appear by the bare ſtating the Queſtion; but onely to ſay enough for him whom the ſubſtance can content, without engaging into unneceſſary and circumſtantial diſputes.

He begins his Book, telling us nothing can be objected with more colour of truth againſt the *Church of England*, than that they have withdrawn themſelves from obedience to the Vicar of Chriſt, and ſeparated from the Communion of the Catholike Church. And that this crime is juſtly charg'd upon his Church, not onely with colour, but with undeniable evidence of fact, will appear by the re-

ry

ry position of the Case; and the nature of his Exceptions.

As for the first, it is unquestionably certain, and universally assented to by all Protestants, who understand any thing, that at the beginning of *Henry the eighths* Reign, nay at his first courting his Protestant Mistress, the *Church of England* agreed with that of *Rome*, and all the rest of her Communion, in two Points, which were then, and are still the Bonds of Unity betwixt all her Members: One concerning *Faith*; the other, *Government*.

For Faith, her Rule was, that the Doctrines, which had been inherited from their Forefathers, as the Legacies of Christ and his Apostles, were solely to bee acknowledg'd for obligatory, and nothing in them to bee changed.

For Government, her Principle was, that *Christ* had made *St. Peter* First, or Chief, or Prince of his Apostles; who was to be the *first Mover* under him in the Church, after his departure out of this world, and to whom all others, in difficulties concerning matters belonging to the universal, either Faith or Government, should have recourse; And that the Bishops of Rome, as Successors of *St. Peter*, inherited from him this priviledge, in respect of the Successors of the rest of the Apostles; and actually exercised this power in all those countries which kept Communion with the Church of Rome that very year wherein this unhappy separation began.

It is no lesse evident, that in the dayes of *Edward* the sixth, Queen *Elizabeth*, and her Successors, neither the former Rule of Unity

of *Faith*, nor this second of Unity of *Government* (which is held by the first) have had any power in that Congregation, which the Protestants call the *English Church*. This is our chief objection against you.

As for us, our Tenet is, That those Churches, who continue in Communion with the Roman, are the onely Churches; which, in vertue of the first Principle above mentioned, have the true Doctrine; and, in vertue of the second, the right Government; and, in vertue of both, the unity and incorporation into the Church of Christ, necessary for salvation: And by consequence, Wee hold them onely to make the entire Catholike or Universal Church of Christians; all others, by misbelief or Schism, being excluded.

Now, because no understanding man can deny this to be the true Charge, the only way for a Protestant to clear his Church from Schism, is to shew it nor guilty of doing this, either by disproving the former to be the necessary Rule of Unity in Faith, or the latter the necessary Bond of Government; both which, though they sometimes say, yet because in these Books, professedly composed for their *Vindication* from the guilt of *Schism*, they, directly and of set purpose, handle neither; it is clear they intend to shuffle, not speak pithily.

The first Principle (which also includes the truth of the second) wee hold by this manifest Evidence, that still the latter Age could not bee ignorant of what the former beleev'd; and, as long as it adhered to that method, nothing could bee alter'd in it;

which

which way of assurance carries with it the Testimony of all that are truly called Christians; and this by so ample a memory and succession, as is stronger than the stock of humane Government and action: no right of Law or humane Ordinances being able to offer so ample, clear, and continued a Title.

They must remember how their Forefathers, who began that which they call the *Reformation*, were themselves of this profession before their pretended reform. They ought to weigh what reasons their Ancestors should have had to introduce such an alteration. They must confesse themselves guilty in continuing the breach, unless they can alledge causes sufficient to have begun it, had the same ancient Religion descended to these daies; For the constant beleefe of the Catholike world both was at the time of your division, and still is, that these Principles are Christs own ordination, recorded in Scripture, derived to us by the strongest Evidences that our nature is capable of, to attain assurance what was done in Antiquity; Evidences inviolable by any humane either power or proof, except perfect and rigorous demonstration, to which our Adversaries doe not so much as pretend, and therefore without further dispute, remain unanswerably convicted of *Schism*.

And though after this, it bee superfluous to say any thing to any Book, which does not so much as attempt to demonstrate either of these Points false, yet I shall bestow a few thoughts to declare the quality of the Lord of *Derry's* Arguments, not examining them any further, than to shew how little they are to the purpose.

In

In his two first Chapters, though there bee many things false, and more taken up without proof, yet I will not touch them, because hee onely pretends to settle the Question, which is already done for my part; And so I will begin my *Animadversions*, where he begins his *Arguments*, in the third Chapter.

His first proof is, because not Protestants, but Roman Catholikes themselves made the first separation. 1. If it were so, how does that acquit you? since continuance in a Breach of this nature, which cannot be sodered by time, is as guilty as the very beginning. Now these two Bonds of Unity, being of Christs own institution, no time can sear the bleeding wound; And this because we hold by the fore-declared strength, they now must have demonstrations to contradict it, as well as the first Separaters.

2. How does he prove they were not Protestants? because they persecuted Protestants: what then? did not *Luther* persecute *Carolstadius* and *Zuinglius*? doe they not now in *Germany* and other Countries? *Lutherans* permit no *Calvinists*; *Calvinists* no *Lutherans*. Did not you persecute *Puritans* and *Brownists*? Doe you not now complain to bee persecuted by others? will you make all these, Papists? or why are not they Reformers as well as you? you will say many of these first breakers died *Catholikes*; True, but upon Repentance. Of *Gardiner* (whom you presse so particularly) it is recorded, that upon his death-bed, he said, *Peccavi cum Petro, exivi cum Petro, sed nondum flevi cum Petro*; and so fell on a bitter weeping for that offence.

But

But in a word, is not this renouncing the Pope the moſt eſſential point of your Reformation? All the reſt your good natur'd Religion can either embrace or cenſure; and, as occaſion ſerves, admit or refuſe Communion with the deniers of any other Article, never ſo fundamental, this only is indiſpenſable. Then be ſure wee never hear you again deny but that they who made this firſt Breach, had in them the quinteſſence of your Reformation, and were far leſs conſiſtent with Catholiciſm, than your modern younger-brother Sectaries are with your kind of Proteſtancy; ſince your ſelves confeſs the admittance of the Popes Authority more deſtructive to you, than the denial of Prelacy.

His ſecond Argument is, becauſe in the ſeparation of *England* from *Rome*, there was no new Law made, but onely their ancient Liberties vindicated.

The firſt part is ſo notoriouſly falſe, that I wonder any one can have the face to pronounce it; a Law was made in *Henry* the 8ths time, an Oath invented and exacted, by which was given to the King to be Head of the Church, and to have all the power the Pope did at that time poſſeſs in *England*. That this was a new Law none but impudence it ſelf can deny.

As for the ſecond part, let us ſee how hee proves it. Hee brings divers allegations, wherein the Popes pretences were not admitted, as being in the prejudice to the State or Church of *England*. What is this man about, that hee ſo forgets the queſtion? Doe wee profeſſe the Pope can pretend no more than his right? or is the queſtion of this or that par-

ticular action of the Popes? or does he think a legitimate Authority in common is rejected, when the particular faults of them who are in Authority are resisted? Is Magistracy or Royalty rejected, when Pleas are commenced against Kings or Commonwealths, as going beyond their true Jurisdiction? Yes, but the Pope is expressly deny'd the Power to doe such or such things. Why then, even by this fact hee is acknowledged to have power in other things; since to limit an Authority implyes an admittance of it in cases to which the restraints extend not.

But hee presses Lawes anciently receiv'd in our Kingdome. What is his meaning? were not those Lawes in force in the beginning of *Henry* the eighths Reign? or was his breach but the conservation of these Lawes, and wee began our Religion there? Are there any of these laws which are not equivalently in *France*, *Spain*, *Germany*; Nay *Ita'y* it selfe? Are none of these therefore Catholikes? are they in as little communication with the Pope, as *Henry* the eighth after his breach, or the Protestants in Q. *Elizabeths* times? How ridiculous, how impudent a manner of speaking and arguing is this? to force his Readers to renounce their eyes and ears and all evidence.

In this *fifth Chapter*, hee argues out of the Liberties of the Britannick Churches. But first I would know what this belongs to us, unless it bee prov'd that their practicks were an obliging precedent to us; have wee any Title from the Britannick Churches, otherwise than by the Saxon Christians, who onely were our Ancestors, and by whose conquests and laws,

lawes all that is in the Britannick World belongs to us, and is derived to us; Yet is this also false: For nothing in History is more evident, than that the British Churches admitted appellations to *Rome* at the Council of *Sardica*: And, as much as we have Records in our Historians of the Pope *Eleutherius*, so much appeares the Popes Authority in that time. And out of St. *Prosper contra Collatorem, & in Chron.* Wee have that the Pope *Celestinus*, by his care, and sending St. *German*, *Vice sua*, in his own stead, freed the *Britans* from *Pelagianism*, and converted the *Scots* by *Palladius*, though Venerable *Bede*, as far as I remember, does not touch that circumstance.

But that which is mainly to the purpose, is, that since the Priviledge wee pretend was one that descends upon the Pope, in quality of Successor to St. *Peter*, how far it was executed, may be unknown, but that it was due, none can bee ignorant. And here our late Bishop begins to shuffle from the priviledge of St. *Peter*, to the Patriarchal Jurisdiction of the Pope, which is another, an historical, a mutable power, and so concernes not our present debate.

Two objections he makes seem to deserve an answer; First, That the *Welsh*, or *Britans*, sided with the Eastern Churches against the Roman in the observation of Easter. To which I answer, 'tis true, they observ'd not Easter right, yet never so much as cited the Eastern Churches, in abetment of their practise, but onely the customs of their own Ancestors: Neither was there any cause of siding,

wee

wee not hearing it was ever prefsed by the Church of *Rome*, after *Victor's* time, to any height. The Council of *Nice*, and the Emperour *Constantine* exhorted the Christian World to it, but without any coercitive force: And if the *Britans* resisted, or rather neglected them, I think wee ought not to say they *sided* against them, but onely did not execute their desires.

St. Ireneus was of the French Church, yet testifies this question was no matter of division; so that it cannot bee gues'd by this what influence the Roman Church had or had not upon the British. It seemes certain also, that St. *Lupus* and *Germanus* neglected this Point, that is, thought it not necessary to be corrected; however St. *Austin* seem'd more rigorous. And though *Palladius*, sent from *Celestinus*, converted the *Scots*, yet we find some of them in the same practise.

The second Objection is out of a piece of a worn Welsh Manuscript, hoped by the Protestants to bee a Copy of some ancienter Original, which, though it has already been proved a manifest forgery, counterfeited by all likelyhood in Q. *Elizabeths* time, when the English Protestants sought to corrupt the Welsh, by Catechisms and other Writings, printed and not printed; Yet if their great Antiquaries can shew, that in St. *Gregories* time, this name *Papa*, or *Pope*, taken by it self, without other addition, as *Papa Urbis Romæ*, &c. was put (as in later ages) for the Bishop of *Rome*, I shall confesse my selfe much surpriz'd. If they cannot, these very words sufficiently convince the Manuscript to bee a meer Imposture.

Another

Another ſuſpition againſt the legitimarnes of this paper naturally ariſes from this, that Sr. *Henry Spelman*, one ſo diligent in wiping off the du.t from old writings, found no other Antiquity in it worth the mention; which ſhrewdly implies the Book was made for this alone. And ſo this demonſtrative proof of the Biſhop, is a conviction of the forgery of ſome counterfeit Knaue, and the eaſineſs of aſſent in Mr. *Moſten*, and the Knight.

Iu his 6th Chapter he pretends three things; 1. That the King and Church of England had ſufficient Authority to withdraw their obedience from *Rome*. 2ly, That they had ſufficient grounds for it; and 3ly, That they did it with due moderation. I doubt not but the intelligent Reader underſtands by the firſt point, that the Biſhop meanes to ſhuffle away the true difficulty; and, whereas the Queſtion is of the Priviledge given by Chriſt to Saint *Peter*, and from him deſcended to the Popes, his Succeſſors, ſpend his time about a Patriarchal Authority, which wee alſo acknowledge to be of humane inſtitution; And here I muſt confeſſe, that generally when no body oppoſes him, his Lordſhip carries it clearly and gives his empty Reader full ſatisfaction.

Hee tells you out of Catholike Authors, that Princes may reſiſt the oppreſſions of Eccleſiaſticks, and themſelves have priviledge to exerciſe Eccleſiaſtical Jurisdiction: That Popes have been convented and depoſed: That Emperors have changed Patriarchs, and that the Kings of *England* have as much power as Emperors. And all this to handle the Queſtion, which is not in hand, ſince our diſpute

is

is not what can be done in respect of the Popes Patriarchal Authority, which the good Bishop himself professes the Pope has renounced these 600. years.

No doubt but th'other two points will follow the former in milling the Question. For, admitting the Popes Authority to bee derived from Christ, what grounds can there bee for renouncing it, or what moderation is the rejecting it capable of? Nay even, if it were of humane institution, many things there are which cannot bee rejected, unless it appear the abuses are not otherwise remediable.

Suppose then the Christian World had chosen themselves one Head for the preservation of so precious a Jewel, as Unity in Religion, how great absurdities must that Head commit, what wrongs must it doe, to cause it selfe to bee justly deposed, and not onely the Person deposed, but the very Government abolish't.

Suppose again, that this alteration should bee made by some one party of the Christian Common-wealth, which must separate it selfe from the assistance and communication of the rest of Christianity; ought not far weightier causes bee expected, or greater abuses committed?

Suppose thirdly, that by setting aside this Supreme Head, eternal dissentions will inevitably follow in the whole Church of Christ, to the utter ruine of faith and good life, which *our Saviour* thought worth the comming down from Heaven to plant among us; and then tell mee, whether the refusal to comply with the humours of a lustful Prince, be ground enough to renounce so necessary an Authority. Let

the

the Bishop bee now asked, whether Kings deserve to bee deposed, and Monarchy it selfe rejected for such abuses as hee gathers against the Pope? or whether there may not easily bee made a collection of as many and great misgovernments against the Court of *England*, or any other Country? Let him remember whether like abuses were not alledged against his own Parliamentary-Prelacy, when it was put down. Will hee justifie, that if the misdemeanours pretended against them had been true, the extirpation of Prelacy had been lawfull? Surely hee would find out many remedies which hee would think necessary to bee first tryed; and *Scroggin* should as soon have chosen a tree to bee hanged on, as hee have ended the number of expedients to be tryed, before hee would give his assent to the extirpation of Episcopacy.

It is then of little concern to examine whether his complaints bee true or false, since he does not shew there was no other remedy but division: and much more, since it is known, if the authority be of Christs institution, no just cause can possibly be given for its abolishment: but most, because all other Catholick Countries might have made the same exception which *England* pretends, yet they remain still in communion with the Church of *Rome*, whose Authority you cry out against as intolerable; nay, the former Ages of our Country, which your false cite, had the same cause to cast the Popes supremacy out of the land, yet rather preferred to continue in the peace of the Church, then attempt so destructive an innovation as Schism draws after it. Neither now

after

after we have broke the ice, do our neighbour Nations think it reasonable to follow our example, and drown their unity in the waters of Contradiction.

Lastly, the pretences on which the English Schism was originally made, were far different from those you now take up to defend it; there was then no talk of imposing new *Creeds* as the conditions of Communion; no mention of the abominations of *Idolatry* and *Superstition*, which now fill your Pulpits; nor indeed any other original quarrel, but the Popes proceeding according to the known Lawes of the Church, which unfortunately happen'd to bee contrary to the tyrannical humour of the King.

The other point of due moderation, is a very pleasant Topick, had I a mind to answer at large his Book; The first part of moderation, is the separating themselves from their Errours, not their Churches; this signifies to declare them Idolaters, superstitious, wicked, and nevertheless communicate with them; reconciling thus light to darkness, and making Christ and Antichrist to be of the same society. I confesse this a very good moderation for him that has no Religion in his heart, or acknowledges his own the worst, there being no danger for him to fear seducing by communication with others. But whoever is confident of his own, by this very fact implicitely disapproves others. I cannot say mine is true, but I must say the opposite is false: mine is good, but the opposite, I must say, is naught: mine necessary, but I must judge that which is inconsistent carries to damnation, though I am bound both to

to pity and love the person that dissents. Therefore, who does not censure a contrary Religion, holds not his own certain, that is, hath none.

The second part of moderation hee places in their inward charity, which, if hee had manifested by their external works, we might have had occasion to beleeve him: Our Saviour telling us the tree is known by the fruit it bears.

The third part therefore, hee is pleased to think may bee found, in that they onely take away Points of Religion, and adde none. Wherein is a double Errour. For first, to take away goodnesse, is the greatest evil that can be done. What more mischievous than to abrogate good lawes, good practises. Let them look on the Scotch Reformation, who have taken the memory of Christ from our eyes, by pulling down Pictures and Crosses; the memory of His principal actions, by abolishing Holydayes; the esteem of vertue, by vilifying his Saints, and left him onely in the mouths of babling Preachers, that disfigure him to the people, as themselves please. What if they took away the New Testament too, and even solemn Preaching, and left all to the will of a frantick Teacher, were not this a great moderation, because they added nothing?

The second abuse is, that he who positively denies, ever adds the contrary to what hee takes away. Hee that makes it an Article, there is no Purgatory, no Mass, no prayer to Saints, has as many Articles, as he who holds the contrary. Therefore this kind of moderation is a pure folly.

The

The last Point hee deems to be a preparation of mind to beleeve and practise whatever the Universal Church beleeves and practises; and this is the greatest mock-fool Proposition of all the rest. First they will say, there is no Universal Church, or if any, indeterminate, that is, no man knowes which it is; and then, with a false and hypocritical heart, professe a great readiness to beleeve and obey it. Poor Protestants, who are led by the nose after such silly Teachers and Doctrines: who, following the steps of our old mother *Eve*, are flatter'd with the promises of knowledge, like the knowledge of God, but paid onely with the pure experience of evil.

In his seventh Chapter, hee professes, that all Princes and Republicks of the Roman Communion, doe in effect the same things which the Protestants doe, when they have occasion, or at least plead for it. What non sense will not an ill cause bring a desperate man to? All this while hee would perswade the World that Papists are most injurious to Princes, prejudicing their Crowns, and subjecting their Dominions to the will of the Pope. Hee has scarce done saying so, but with a contrary blast drives as far back again, confessing all hee said to be false; and that the same Papists hold the very doctrine of the Protestants *in effect*, and the difference is onely in words: So that this Chapter seems expressly made to justifie the Papists, and to shew, that, though the Popes sometimes personally exceed, yet when their passion is over, or the present interest ceases, then they acknowledge for Catholikes and Orthodox, those who before oppos'd them, as

alle

alſo that the Catholike Divines, who teach the doctrine of reſiſting the Pope in ſuch occaſions, are not, for that, caſt out of Communion; which is as much as to ſay, it is not our Religion, or any publick Tenet in our Church, that binds any to thoſe rigorous aſſertions, which the Proteſtants condemn.

If this be ſo, what can juſtifie your bloody Lawes, and bloodier Execution, for the fourſcore years you were in power? Why were the poor Prieſts, who had offended no farther than to receive from a Biſhops hands the power of conſecrating the body of Chriſt, condemned to die a Traitors death? Why the Layman, that harboured any ſuch perſon, made liable to the ſame forfeiture of eſtate and life? Why were Baptiſms, Churchings, Burials, Marriages, all puniſhed? Why were men forced to goe to your Synagogues under great penalties? Seldom any lawful conviction exacted, but proceeding upon meer ſurmiſes. A Prieſt, arreſted upon the leaſt ſuſpition, and hurried before the Magiſtrate, was not permitted to refer his cauſe to witneſſes, but compelled to be his own Accuſer; and, without any ſhadow of proof ſo much as enquir'd after, if he deny'd not himſelfe, immediatly ſent to priſon as a Traitor. A Prieſt, comming to his Trial before the Judges, was never permitted to require proof of his being a Prieſt; It ſufficed, that, having ſaid *Maſs*, or heard a Confeſſion, he could not prove himſelfe a knave.

What ſhall I ſay of the ſetting up of *Purſuivants* to hare poor Catholikes in all places and times; I have ſeen, when generally they kept

their houſes cloſe-ſhut, and, if any knock't, there was a ſudden pang and ſollicitude, before they durſt open their doors. They could neither eat nor ſleep in any other ſecurity, than that which a good Conſcience gave them.

But the cruelſt part of all, was to defame us of Treaſon. Firſt you make a Law, that, to acknowledge the Succeſſor of *S. Peter* had a common ſuperintendency over the Church, was Treaſon; and then brand us for Traitors. Should a *Presbyterian* or *Independent* Power make it Treaſon to acknowledge *Prelacy*, would you think it reaſonable preſently to conclude all the older-faſhion'd Proteſtants Traitors?

Nor can I perſwade my ſelfe I offer any violence to Charity, if I plainly and roundly charge you, that in all this you proceeded flatly againſt your Conſciences, it being impoſſible you ſhould really judge the bare receiving Orders beyond Sea to be Treaſon, which is abundantly convinc't by your very offer of pardon, nay ſometimes preferment, if hee, whom you made the people beleeve was a dangerous and bloody Traitor, would but go to Church with you; For what Prieſt dyed for being a Prieſt, but hee might have reſcu'd himſelfe at the laſt hour by ſuch ſubmiſſion? What Prieſt was ſo bad, whom you were not ready to entertain with honour, if hee would take party with you?

So unlucky is his Lordſhip in this Chapter, that, whatever his intention is, he abſolves us, or at leaſt condemns *himſelfe*, if he would be underſtood as the Letter of his Exceptions ſounds,

founds, he absolutely clears our Religion of a calumny, which the Protestants most injuriously charge upon us, that our vassalage to the Pope destroyes our subjection to our Prince; citing so many instances, where Catholikes, remaining such, have disobey'd the Pope. If he on purpose layes his sense to bee ambiguous, of which I have some jealousie, because hee uses that jugling phrase *in effect*, then hee absolutely proves himselfe a Deceiver. In short, if he mean honestly, he justifies us; if otherwise, every honest man will condemn him; But whatever his inward meaning is, the Case open'd will declare it self.

Christ, being to build his spiritual Kingdom upon the Basis, not onely of the Roman Monarchy, then flourishing, but of a multitude of Kingdomes, either bred out of the destruction of that, or originally independent and distinct from it, which, in process of time, should embrace his Faith, saw it necessary to make such a band of Unity betwixt the Churches, of which his spiritual Empire was to be integrated, that it neither should be offensive to temporal Princes, nor yet unprovided of meanes to keep the Church in such amity as to be able to work like the Congregation of *Hierusalem*, which had *Cor unum & animam unam*. For this reason he gave the principality among his Apostles to *S. Peter*, and consequently to his Successors among theirs. The effect of this Principality was, that when publick meetings of Bishops were necessary, all emulation, who should have recourse to the other, was taken away, since it was known all were to defer to him, meet as and where was most fitting for him.

Again, if any inconvenience fel among Christians, there wanted not one who was by office to look to it, though in the place where it fell out, there were no superior Authority to curb the offenders. This one Seat might, by the ordinary providence of Almighty God, keep a continuance of Succession from *S. Peter* to the end of the World, whereas the vicissitude of humane nature permitted not the like to be done to all the Sees where all the rest of the Apostles had signed their Faith by their precious death. Hence 'tis the See of *Rome* is invested with the special priviledge of Mother and Mistress of the Church. But, not to dive into all, or the questionable consequences of this Primacy, this onely I intend to insist upon; that it is the hinge upon which all the common government and unity in Faith, Sacraments, Ceremonies, and communication of spiritual Fraternity depends, which being removed, the Church vanishes into a pure Anarchy, no one Province or Country having the least obligation to any other, to repair to it, to obey it, to make Meetings and common Ordinances with it. So that the whole frame of the Church will be utterly dissolv'd, ceasing to be a Church, and becomming a ruinous heap of stones, precious indeed in themselves, but without order, shape, or connexion.

By this it clearly followes, whatever is the truth of those Questions which our Bishop reckons up to have been disputed between other Christian Countries and the Papacy, that as long as this Principality wee speak of, is acknowledged, so long there is an Unity in the

the Christian Church, all particular Churches being by this subordination perfectly one, both with their Head, and among themselves. This is the bridle our Saviour put in the mouth of his Church, to wield it sweetly which way he pleased. No dissention in Faith or Discipline, nay not any war among Christian Princes could annoy the World, if this Authority were duly preserved and governed; Many excellent effects we have seen of it, and more the world is likely to enjoy, when the admirable conveniences of it shall bee unpassionately understood.

What Christian Prince can chuse but be glad to have an Arbitrator, so prudent, so pious, so disinteressed, as a good Pope should be, to reconcile differences, and to hinder bloodshed, either in his own people, or between his neighbours; And, who sees not, that the Popes office and condition, among those who reverence him, is perfectly proper for such an effect beyond the hopes of wisedom that had not known th'exprience of it. What a desperate attempt then is it to bite at this bridle, and strive to put the whole Christian World in confusion? This is your crime, in this consists your Schism, in this your impiety and wickedness.

Agreeing then, that this is the substance of the Papacy, temporal preheminences and wealth being but accidental to it, wee shall presently see all those arrows which the Bishop shoots against us, fall directly on his own head; For if the Papacy stand firm and strong in all those Countries that have resisted the Pope when they conceived hee encroach'd on their

liberties, it is evident, notwithstanding all such disputes, the Being and Nature of *one Church* is entirely conserved, they all governing themselves in an Unity of Faith and Sacraments and Correspondence like one Body, as is visible to any that will but open his eyes, and so are Members of one Christian Community. Whereas the Reform (as they call it) has cut off *England* from all this communication and correspondence, and made it no part of any Church, greater than it self; and by consequence, that can pretend to Universality and Catholicism, but a headless Synagogue, without Brotherhood or Order; if joyned with any other, it is not in a common head, but with the tayles of opposition to the Roman Catholike.

No more can the several Protestant Churches be allow'd to compose one Body, than all the ancient Hereticks did, nay than *Turks* and *Jewes* and *Christians* may be now said to doe; since the sole root of unity Protestants can pretend, is onely their agreement in certain general Points, which most of the old Hereticks profess'd; and even *Turks*, and *Jewes* beleeve some part of the Christian Faith: As for the Protestant distinction, that all are of one Communion, who agree in fundamentals, 'tis no better than a meer shift, til they exhibit a list of such Points, and prove them obligingly and satisfactorily to all the rational people of the World, that they, and they onely, are essential to Christian Communion.

His eighth Chapter would fain be thought to prove the *Pope* and Court of *Rome* guilty of Schism. First, because shee takes upon her

her to bee Mistresse, where shee is but Sister to other Churches. It is their saying, and our denying it, till they have proved what they affirm. The second Argument is a meer calumny, that shee obtrudes new Creeds, and unjustly excommunicates those who will not receive them.

At the third blow hee layes the Axe (as he sayes) to the root of *Schism*; but, if I understand his words, it is to his own legs. The Papacy (sayes hee) *qua talis*, which hee interpretes, as it is maintain'd by many. Good-night my Lord of *London-Derry*, for certainly your wits are in the dark. If you once begin to say, *as it is maintain'd by many*, you imply, it is not maintain'd by all, and therefore not the Papacy *qua talis*, for so Catholikes have not the least difference amongst them. If you will dispute against private Opinions, cite your Authors, and argue against them, not the Church, whose beleefe is contain'd in the Decrees of Councils, and universal consent of Fathers and Doctors.

His fourth Charge is, that the Popes hold themselves to bee Bishops of every particular See; which is a more gross and false imputation than any of the rest. Other two branches he offers at, but confesses them not to be decided in our Church, and therefore can make nothing for him.

His ninth Chapter pretends to solve the Romanists Arguments; and first that grand one of *Schism*; which hee maintaines to be so clearly unimputable to Protestants, that he sayes they hold Communion with thrice as

many Christians as wee doe. And truly, if by Christians, he meanes those who lay claim to the name of Christ, I neither deny his answer, nor envy him his multitude; For *Manichees, Gnosticks, Carpocratians, Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, &c.* without number, all usurp to themselves the honour of this Title; and I most faithfully protest, I do not think his Lordship has any solid reason to refuse Communion to the worst of them. But if he meanes by *Christians*, those, who never changed the doctrine which their Fathers taught them, as received from the Apostles, so let him shew me one, who is not in communion with the Roman Church, and I also shall be of that one's Communion.

The second Argument hee undertakes, is, That Protestants admit not the *Council of Trent*. To which hee replies, it was not Generall, because the Heretical Patriarchs were not called; many Bishops were absent; too many *Italians* there; fewer Bishops present at the determination of weightiest Points, than the King of England could assemble in a moneth. What trivial stuff is this? Is not a *Parliament* the General Representative of the Nation, unless every Lord, though a known and condemn'd Rebel, be summon'd? or unless every Member, that has a right to sit there, bee present? Who is so impertinent, as to quarrel at the generalness of a *Parliament*, if some Court-Lords bee admitted to their Voices? or if the number of Voters in some Parliaments bee fewer than in others? What's this to the purpose, if none that have a

true

true right, be excluded? Yet these are the grand Exceptions; only in some words, wherein hee expresses his anger, Passion made him quite forget they might possibly be retorted upon his own condition; else what a blindness is it to call the Bishops of *Italy*, *hungry parasitical Pensioners*? It seemes, my Lord, you keep a good Table, speak the truth boldly, and have great Revenues, independent of any.

As for the instance of the French Churches non-admittance of the *Counsil of Trent*, your selfe confesses it is there received for matters of doctrine; and I confesse, that for other Canons, the execution of them may be omitted, unlesse the true Superiours presse their observance.

Secondly, he sayes it was not free; A false and injurious calumny, taken out of *Sleidan*, accounted by our part a frank lyar and forger.

Thirdly, he feigns an Objection to himself, their breaking from the Patriarchat, which already wee have clear'd, is not the question, and himself, though weakly and fillily, endeavours to prove cannot stand with the claim of Papal Authority from Christ. After these, he descends to consider such of our Arguments as hee is pleas'd to think of lesser importance.

As first, That Protestants have no Clergy; because no Priests: For the notion of a Priest is to bee a Sacrificer, and their Reform renounces all truly called Sacrifice. This he hides in obscure and common terms of matter

and

and form, and shuffles likewise certain common words in Answer.

Secondly, because their *Ministers*, whom they term *Priests*, were made by no Bishops. The Controversie is largely treated by Doctor *Champney* against *Mason*. Hee answers it with childish and impudent words. Father *Olacra*, whom he cites, was known to be a weak and timorous man, who might bee easily surprised. I could never hear, that any Catholike, esteemed judicious, was ever admitted to a free perusal of their Registers; but know wel, that the Contemporaries protested against any lawful Ordination of their first Bishops, and were answer'd by silence. He sayes they hold no spiritual Jurisdiction from the Crown; But the Statutes of the Nation, and their own Oaths say the contrary. Let him dispute it with the Lawyers.

The tenth Chapter containes what he expects to be the result of his Book. Hee first complaines of hard usage, and thinks the very *Turk* not so cruel as those who now persecute Protestants in *England*. Truly no good man, I beleeve, wishes his Party harm; But mee thinks he might remember, they *suffer* not so much as themselves have *done* in their Reign, against those, who, in respect of them, were *Aborigines*; whose possession was the same that Christian Religion had among us; And would to God, they could, even now be quiet and friendly, when they are *in eadem damnatione*; Prelacy, as well as Popery, being voted *damnable Heresie* by the late Parliament.

'Tis

'Tis true, their Religion, as consider'd including Episcopacy, is cast out of the Land; but then how comes Episcopacy so be essential to their Religion? Have not the Bishops always profess'd themselves of the same Communion with the *Huguenots* of *France*, the *Zuinglians* of *Switzerland*, &c. who hold Episcopacy abominable? The persons of such Bishops as reside in *England*, and are accus'd of nothing but Episcopacy, live free and secure, enjoy their whole Estates, except what belonged to their Dignity, and have no Oaths impos'd on their Consciences. Were Catholikes permitted this liberty, I am confident you should seldom hee troubled with hearing their complaints of Persecution; and yet on all occasions you are still upraiding the liberty given to Papists, which is a meer blindness of malice. Do you not see all the Catholikes of *England*, such as never engag'd in the war, are, purely upon the score of Religion, at this day sequestred, and two thirds of their Estates taken from them? Doe you not see our Priests, when discover'd, proceeded against as Traitors? is it not enough to satisfie your uncharitable eys, that so many of them have been hang'd, drawn and quarter'd for their Religion?

Are these the men that pretend moderation, and all day long cry up *brotherly Charity*? I will offer them this bargain, in the name of all the Catholikes of *England*, who I am perswaded will readily subscribe the Contract. That two indifferent persons read over all the Statutes made since the Reformation, and every

every where, in stead of *Papist*, write *Protestant*, with this mercy too, that the execution shall be now and then interrupted, and a condemned Minister sometimes have reprive, nay, and more than wee can obtain of them, they shall enjoy all the priviledges of Papists, without the least envy from us. If they refuse this faire offer, let them never hereafter be so impertinent as to repine at our liberty, and with the same breath complain of their own sufferings.

As to his desirable intention of Unity in the Church; First I could wish they would let real Charity take root in their hearts. Secondly, not think the misdemeanours of some Popes a sufficient warrant to break the Unity of the Church. Thirdly, to receive the root of Christianity, that is, a practical Infallibility in the Church, the ready and onely meanes to know the truth of Christs Law; which being denied, there is no Religion left in the World.

This is that which is chiefly requir'd, without this, how muchsoever wee have Christ in our tongues, wee are Atheists in our hearts, proud Luciferian Erecters of our selves above all that's called God, Judgers of Christ and his Law, not obeyers and servants. This is that which onely can make a Reconciliation both in Doctrine and Government; and, as long as it is neglected, all wee endeavour towards peace, is labour cast away. If truly and cordially hee, or any other study meanes for peace, let them

them endeavour it so as to leave a Religion and a known Law of Christ, and an open method of comming to it in the World. Otherwise all lovers of Christ and Christianinity can have no share or participation with them.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 3. Line 1. *Parricide.* p. 8. l. 9. *Nice.* p. 18. l. 31. *ſelf-acknowledg'd.* p. 33. l. 10. *Pope.* p. 37. l. 1. *Sect.* 6. p. 40. l. 8. other *Crew.* p. 67. l. 34. *this.* p. 68. l. 3. given *by.* p. 88. l. 11. *Premiſſes.* p. 96. l. 9. *alleaging.* p. 101. l. 32. *call'd.* p. 105. l. 22. *ſolv'd.* p. 110. l. 21. *which* can. p. 115. l. 2. quære the Title in the Table. p. 118. l. 34: ſhews *it.* p. 119. l. 4. *Patriarchs.* l. 24. *the* Novel. p. 123. l. 30. be *one man or* one horſ p. 143. l. 3 did it *not.* p. 147. l. 5. *by* ſome p. 157. l. 29. *rake.* p. 162. l. 21. *Arch-*Heretick. p. 163. l. 10. *Quid.* p. 199. l. 3. *their* ſu- p. 210. l. 20. *which.* p. 217. l. 24. *flagrant.* p. 223. l. 31. *on* any. p. 223. l. 13: *it in.* p. 256. l. 1. *by your.* p. 259. l. 20. *as* they. p. 280. l. 2. *in* that. p. 288. l. 20. *of your.* p. 312. l. 29. in *his.*